

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXXVII, No. 4  
WHOLE No. 919

May 7, 1927

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE .....	73-76
EDITORIALS	
Weasel Words in Mexico—Catholics and the Public School—A Catholic in the White House—Jail, the Padlock and the Stage—How Protestant Is This Country?—Should John Go to College? .....	77-79
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Woman and the Catholic Church—Those Prohibitionists—Debating the Mexican Question—Techny Retreats—Cameos for May .....	80-88
POETRY	
Ave Maria—Questionnaire—A Bouquet of Stars—To the Nurse of Man—To a Carrara Virgin—Mater Pulcherrima—Renunciation—To Those Who Sing of Our Lady .....	87-91
SOCIOLOGY	
Mothers Day in the Schools .....	87-88
EDUCATION	
The Nation's Fictitious Corner-Stone .....	88-90
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF .....	90
LITERATURE	
Wrecker of Engines .....	92-93
REVIEWS .....	93-95
COMMUNICATIONS .....	96

these principles to Mexico, the President recalled that "we have had claims against that country running over a long series of years, growing out of the death of many of our citizens and the loss of their property amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars." Some of these losses were due to revolutionary outbreaks, "but lately our difficulties have been increased by the enactment of laws by the Government itself which we feel threaten the virtual confiscation of the property of our citizens, even where their holdings are under titles which have been established for scores of years." A statement of the President's policy, with some comment, is given on the editorial page of this Review.

The President wished to see the same policy of conciliation continued with regard to Nicaragua and China. The new President of Nicaragua was recognized by our

The Situation in Nicaragua and to other Central American countries and China Government because he "appeared to us to have a constitutional title." On the representation of this official that he was unable to protect American lives and property, a force of American marines was sent to Nicaragua. We have sold arms and ammunition to the established Government, while "the revolutionary forces appear to have received arms and ammunition from some source in Mexico." Our interest in the country is merely to protect American lives and property, to discourage revolution, and to promote the peaceful settlement of all difficulties by the ballot. In China, as in Nicaragua and Mexico, our aims are peaceful. After an attack on an American consulate, and the murder of an American citizen, we joined the other Powers in a note of protest, to which an answer, conciliatory, but not final, has been returned. In the unsettled state which now obtains in China, the only way of securing protection to our citizens seems to lie in having an American force at hand, able to cope with any emergency.

Much suffering and great loss of life and property was occasioned by floods in the Mississippi Valley. On April 28, Secretary of the Interior Hoover, appointed

Mississippi Floods to take charge of the relief work, reported that 300 lives had been lost, more than 200,000 persons had been driven from their homes, and property to the value of \$2,000,000 had been destroyed. Sickness had broken out in many of the refugee camps, and the real number of deaths due to the flood might never be known. The Secretary believed that the floods on the Mississippi and its tributaries could be controlled by adequate engineering works, and

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—Addressing the convention of the United Press in New York on April 25, President Coolidge outlined what was taken to be the policy of the

The President on Mexico Administration on our newer international problems. After some reflections on the freedom of the press, and the expression of his hope that the assembled journalists and the press in general would avoid "malicious and misleading partisan attacks on the conduct of our own Government in its efforts to defend American rights when they are threatened or invaded in foreign countries," the President undertook to discuss our relations with Mexico. According to well-established principles of international law, we have no right to interfere with any nation in its control of domestic affairs. Yet it is equally well established that the Government "has certain rights over and duties towards its own citizens wherever they may be located." When our citizens enter a foreign country, it is proper that they should abide by the laws of that country. However, in entering that foreign country, they do so by a kind of "tacit invitation" which implies protection of the rights secured to them by international law and by the practice of civilized nations. Applying

recommended that this work be undertaken by the Government. Local floods on tributaries to the Mississippi in Illinois and Arkansas also wrought great damage. To avert the threatened flooding of New Orleans a break in the levee below the city was ordered and thousands in the two parishes to be flooded in consequence abandoned their homes and the doomed area. The forced exodus was carried out peaceably and compensation was assured the sufferers for their losses.

**Austria.**—The country successfully passed through another great crisis. The Socialists had set themselves in earnest to gain complete control of the nation by the

**Decisive Elections** ballot. Mgr. Seipel, Austrian Chancellor and head of the Christian Social

party, was no less determined to call into requisition all his resources. The result was a united front of all the middle class parties. In the elections the lesser parties, even the Communists, were for the time practically wiped out of existence. According to official reports, about ninety per cent of the qualified electors cast their votes in the general elections. Although the Socialists gained four or five seats in Parliament, it was regarded as a lost fight for them. Their tremendous agitation and their supreme efforts did not bring the desired returns. The new seats gained by them were all won in Vienna, where every possible concession had been made to the popular vote by the Socialist municipality in power. Not a single seat was wrested from their opponents in the rural sections in spite of their desperate campaign. More than 30,000,000 letters with political propaganda had passed through the mails in the six-weeks' preparatory campaign. The carriers could not handle the staggering load. That it was really a defeat for radicalism in general was further plain from the fact that the Communists, who at the birth of the Republic a few years ago were reaching out for complete supremacy and seemed near to the achievement of their goal, did not return a single Representative. The only small party to survive was the Agrarian, with an insignificant total of five Representatives. "Marxian Socialism," said a special dispatch to the *New York Sun*, "has reached its climax in Austria and in the future will have an increasingly hard fight to hold its present status." With this crisis weathered, Austria can give herself to the serious work of gradual reconstruction. The eminent statesmanship of Mgr. Seipel again manifested itself in this struggle, though his majority will be smaller than before.

**China.**—The general situation showed no improvement. General Chiang Kai-shek, commander of the Southern forces who recently broke with the Cantonese Government at Hankow, continued unsuc-

**Continued Chaos** cessful in his efforts to form a Government at Nanking. There were reports that he was being marched upon by both Northern troops and the forces of the Hankow opposition from the South. The Peking Government published some of

the papers seized in the late Red raids which purported to show that the Soviet paid millions to Nationalists and directed the war on the North. At Hankow especially the situation continued critical. Diplomats of the Powers made no apparent progress in their efforts to reach an agreement about the note to be sent to the Chinese Government.

**Czecho-Slovakia.**—The Papal letter addressed to the Czecho-Slovakian Hierarchy, to which reference was previously made, aroused a new storm in the anti-Catholic

**Relations with the Vatican** press of the country. The Bishops had thanked the Pope for his gift of a plot

of ground on which a new Czecho-Slovakian college might be built at Rome in place of the present small Bohemian college. Their reference to the unhappy relations between the Holy See and their own Government drew from the Pope a reply in which he declared that it was not resentment, but the solemn obligation resting upon him before God, which made it imperative for him to demand a safeguard of the dignity of the Apostolic See and of the rights and honor of the Faithful in Czecho-Slovakia against such outrages as those connected with the anti-Catholic Huss celebrations. The Holy Father, however, does not distrust the present Coalition Government in its negotiations with the Holy See for a settlement of the many questions at issue and for the readjustment of mutual relations. This can obviously be concluded from the fact that only a few days after the publication of the Papal letter Mgr. Pietro Ciriaci, one of the undersecretaries of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, arrived at Prague with his Secretary, Mgr. Ritter. He came to take *ad interim* charge of the Prague Nunciature and was formally welcomed by the Chief of the Ecclesiastical Department of the Czecho-Slovakian Foreign Office. All of which showed that friendly relations were being resumed, but the necessary diplomatic steps must be taken.

**Germany.**—It was anticipated that German militarism would make another gesture in the parade arranged for May 8, by the Steel Helmet League, a reactionary

**Steel Helmets' Parade** veterans' organization. In order not to be identified with this purely private society, which dubs itself "patriotic,"

Field Marshal von Hindenburg expressed his intention to be absent from Berlin on that day. Speaking for the Steel Helmets, who claimed they would enter Berlin 80,000 strong, Herr Seldte, head of the Dresden group, declared: "We are going to Berlin for the purpose of capturing it without arms, undisturbed by the frenzy and lamentations of political reds and pinks." The Republican elements, however, did not trust these pacific proclamations and orders were issued by their organization, the *Reichsbanner*, to be prepared for instant action from the moment the Steel Helmets entered the capital to the time of their departure. The Communists, it was believed, were working out secret plans for preventing

the parade. Should bloody clashes result it would be a good argument for not allowing such events in the future. Field-gray uniforms, however, were not to be used by the paraders, who continued to protest that they meant to "fight for liberty, not as insurgents, but as citizens of the Fatherland."

**Italy.**—The Fascist "Charter of Labor" was promulgated by Premier Mussolini on April 21, at a special meeting of the Fascist Grand Council. The underlying

**Charter of Labor Proclaimed** idea of the Charter is the State's right directly to control all forces of production, acting as the guardian of both capital and labor, establishing equality of rights and duties between them, compelling them to carry out their tasks for the common good, punishing infractions and maintaining peace between them at any cost. It is directly opposed to the Socialist principles of the class-struggle. The State acts as an agent of the nation, which is termed "an organism superior to all single individuals with moral, political and economic unity." Labor, which is a social duty, and property, which accomplishes a social function, are both under the guardianship of the State. Both capital and labor are organized in legally recognized units called associations or syndicates, all relations between them being carried out through collective contracts. Other units, called corporations and acting as the direct agents of the State, control these activities, while specially created labor courts act as the court of last resort in cases of controversies. Strikes, lockouts and boycotts are absolutely forbidden. Both owners and employes are responsible to the Government for increased production. The principle of the minimum wage is denied. Workers' guarantees, however, are generously provided. The corporations with the cooperation of both employers and employes, will control all social, recreational and educational activities in any industry. Private initiative and private property are upheld. In the default of private initiative, the enterprise may be taken over by the State.—The charter was denounced by William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, as "autocracy gone mad," and as "industrial slavery," on a par with the Soviets.

The British proposal, made on behalf of England, France and Germany, that Italy should agree never to invoke the treaty of Tirana or intervene in the domestic affairs of Albania, appeared on April 23

**Albanian Question** to have been rejected by Mussolini. Signor Bordonaro, however, the new Italian Ambassador to Great Britain, was said on April 26 to have presented to Foreign Secretary Chamberlain a memorandum declaring that Italy had no intention of occupying Albania, but that she would not consider revision of the Treaty of Tirana with Albania. Her special interests in Albania were said to compel her not only to guarantee Albania's stability but to be assured that the Government of Albania should be friendly to Italy. Premier Mussolini was said to have expressed willingness to discuss the matter in a friendly manner

with the Jugoslav Foreign Minister. On the other hand, Jugoslavia's proposal to bring her differences with Italy before the League was not looked upon favorably by the Powers. On April 24, at the formation of the new Jugoslavian Cabinet, it was expected that Foreign Minister Marinkovitch would lay the matter before the meeting of the Little Entente at its meeting at Marienbad in May.

The maximum penalty of thirty years' imprisonment was inflicted upon Tito Zaniboni and General Capello, accused of conspiring against the life of Premier Mussolini and of plotting an insurrection against the Fascist State. General Capello, who maintained his innocence in contrast with Zaniboni's defiant admission of guilt, was nevertheless found guilty of complicity in an attempted insurrection and "necessary" complicity in homicide. The evidence of Carlo Quaglia, Zaniboni's former secretary, was used against Capello. On April 23 Domizio Torrigiani, for over twenty years the Grand Master of Italian Freemasonry, was arrested and sentenced by the Provincial Court of Rome to five years' banishment on one of the islands where political prisoners are confined. Witnesses in the Zaniboni-Capello trial had testified that Italian Freemasonry was heavily involved in the plot against the life of Mussolini. His conviction was demanded by the Fascist press.

Despite the fears of economists, the rapid rise of the Italian lira appeared to have brought no disturbances. Commercial Attaché Angelone, in a conference with bankers in New York on April 27, gave four main factors as the cause of the lira's advance: the sound budget, note reductions, increased production, and increased international confidence in Italy's position. After heavy selling of lire by the Italian National Exchange, it dropped from seventeen to nineteen on the dollar on April 27.

**Mexico.**—Despite a rigid censorship, dispatches stated that anti-Calles outbreaks, some political and others religious fostered by the National League of Religious Defense, were frequent and serious. The Government found great difficulty in coping with the situation. Uprisings in ten States were reported. Official accounts announced their prompt suppression, and implied that they were merely sporadic. Information, however, from reliable sources stated that the revolution was increasingly active and that the Government was gravely alarmed. Political leaders heretofore friendly to Calles were reported as forming new alliances, Federal troops were known to have gone over to the revolutionists and desertions in larger numbers were anticipated, the loyalty of many in the army being suspect. Some military engagements resulted in heavy losses to the Government troops. As a result of train attacks the more important passenger trains were being preceded by military trains with machine guns. A report was current that to protect

the trains from ambuses the Government was compelling priests to accompany them as hostages. Despite the gravity of the situation official dispatches "in order to avoid gross exaggerations which might lead to false ideas regarding the prevailing situation" continued to give out most optimistic and inaccurate bulletins.

Far from abating, the program of persecution of the Church got a new impetus. In addition to the deportation of six leading members of the Hierarchy reported

**Churchmen Deported** in last issue, several other Bishops were expelled summarily and without warrant. Statements from Government headquarters alleged that conclusive proof of the churchmen instigating the revolution and especially the Limon outrage was in Calles' possession and that the Bishops preferred exile to standing trial. These statements were all given the lie by the members of the Episcopate reaching the United States. Calles did not present the least shred of evidence for his assertions. On the contrary late and impartial press reports from the scene of the train disaster held the conduct of the federal soldiers to blame for the deaths that occurred among the passengers and cleared the clergy of any leadership in the affair. Nevertheless executions of priests on trumped-up charges of complicity in the rebellion continued.

Indicative of the financial crisis threatening the country was a decree issued through the Treasury Department on April 24, conferring on the Secretary of the Treasury

**Finance Dictator** practically absolute power to limit all domestic expenditures. A reduction in the Government's budget was ordered and the utmost economy insisted on, as well as the sharpest vigilance in collecting all taxes and revenues due the Government. The decree provided for foreign debt payments under the Pani-Lamont agreement but authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to postpone all domestic debt payments. To make the decree effective the Secretary of the Treasury was empowered "to dictate such laws, decrees and regulations as he judges should be ordered."

**Nicaragua.**—The presence of President Coolidge's representative, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, gave rise to hopes for an eventual peaceful settlement of the civil conflict.

**Peace Proposals** He was at work on a plan for pacifying the country and arrangements were made for a conference between himself and representatives of Dr. Sacasa, President of the Liberal Government. Dr. Sacasa declined an invitation to meet Mr. Stimson personally but was sending three of his Cabinet to Managua to discuss the situation with him. Unofficial reports stated that the plan that was being considered included the retention of Diaz as President until the end of 1928; mutual general disarmament; mutual participation of Liberals and Conservatives in the Government; indefinite establishment of limited American forces in the Republic; establishment of a national constabulary of 2,500 men, officered by Americans, for

the preservation of order; adjustment of damage claims and restoration of confiscated property; and, finally, free elections in 1928, guaranteed by the United States should both parties request it.

**League of Nations.**—A new law voted by the Italian Parliament placed League employees of Italian nationality directly under the control of the Italian Minister of

**Italian Control of League Employees** Foreign Affairs. This is directly in contradiction to the Covenant, which gives to the Secretary General of the League absolute right to name the League's personnel, with the approval of the Council. As a matter of courtesy, but only as such, the Secretary General consults the Government concerned in a case where a higher official is appointed and where the nationality is fixed in advance. According to the new law Italian nationals working for international public institutions must secure the permission of the Foreign Office at Rome, and such permission can be refused and the employee forced to resign, without any recourse to justice, and with danger of fine and loss of nationality.

League officials were reported as stating on April 27 that a second invitation would not be sent to the Soviet Government to attend the Economic Conference, opening on May 4, to replace that which the

**No New Invitation to Soviets** Soviet Foreign Minister recently returned with the declaration that it was not a *bona fide* invitation because the conference was being held in Geneva. This attitude was due to the standing grievance of the Soviets against the Swiss Government. "It is for Russia to decide," it was stated, "whether, in view of the recent Swiss agreement, the impediment to the nomination of Soviet members is now removed."

#### In Our Issue of Next Week:

"What Shall We Arbitrate in Mexico?" is answered by Joseph F. Thorning.

The contrast between religious opinion as expressed by the students of certain secular colleges and as manifested by the undergraduates of the University of Santa Clara, taken as a typical Catholic college, is the subject of an incisive article by William I. Lonergan.

The drama and the humorous irony of a great truth are visioned in "The Last Mask," by Cyril B. Egan. "And the end of that masque-ball was even more baffling than its beginning."

Dr. Alfred W. McCann, author of "God—or Gorilla?" has some delicious fun with a modern treatise on "Time, Space and Deity" in a paper entitled "The Professor's Apple Dumpling."

"The Mystery of Francis Carlin" is an appreciation of a poet by a poet, Leonard Feeney, whose first volume, "In Towns and Little Towns," has just been published.

# AMERICA

## A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1927

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS  
Editor-in-Chief

JOSEPH HUSSLIN PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT  
WILLIAM I. LONERGAN JOHN LAFARGE  
Associate Editors  
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, Printing Crafts Building  
Eighth Avenue and Thirty-third Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: Chickering 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

### Weasel Words in Mexico

THE President's address on April 25 at the convention of the United Press in New York has been characterized as "a speech outlining our world policies." The characterization is just. We do not wish to pursue a course of aggression against any nation, said the President in substance; neither in China, Mexico, Nicaragua, nor in any part of the world, do we seek conquest. "In our international intercourse we must hold ourselves up to high standards of justice and equity. We should be slow to take offense and quick to grant redress."

Yet there is a stage in international affairs, as the President admits, when justice and equity can easily degenerate into paltering weakness. At that stage we must stop. We have no right to interfere with the domestic concerns of other nations, yet every self-respecting Government must live up to its duty of protecting its citizens and their property wherever they may be. That is clear. "It would seem to be perfectly obvious," said the President, as he approached the topic of our relations with Mexico, "that if it is wrong to murder and pillage within the confines of the United States, it is equally wrong outside our borders. The fundamental laws of justice are of universal application." And the President then outlines the negotiations between this country and Mexico which have been in progress for nearly ten years.

It is not a pleasant story. Note has followed note, and commission has succeeded to commission. In 1923 Obregon was recognized after solemnly pledging his word that the Constitution of 1917 "was not to be given retroactive or confiscatory application." In the winter of 1924, a revolution would have displaced Oregon, "had not our Government furnished him with arms and ammunition, largely on credit, and given him the advantage of our moral support. Our help maintained his position."

But with what result?

"Soon after President Calles came into power," ans-

wers the President, "he and the Mexican Congress proposed laws and regulations which we deemed threatened confiscation of American property." The American Government protested. "Nevertheless they were passed." The American Government then protested against the enforcement of these confiscatory laws. But "President Calles refuses to be bound by what we thought was the understanding arrived at with President Obregon."

What then?

"Agricultural lands have apparently been seized," answers the President, "for which no compensation has as yet been made . . . . It is a cardinal principle of law that private property should not be taken without fair compensation," yet "under the Constitution of 1917, and by-laws and regulations for carrying it into effect, we feel that Mexico is threatening to disregard this great elementary principle by undertaking a retroactive application to property of our citizens acquired long before the Constitution was adopted."

Anyone acquainted with the story of loot and pillage engineered by the Mexican Government will appreciate the studious restraint of the President's words.

And now?

The President tells us that we have two Commissions working in Mexico to effect a satisfactory basis of arbitration. These Commissions, however, will not consent to arbitrate the confiscation of property lawfully acquired by American citizens. "I can see grave difficulties," comments the President, "in formulating a question which the two Governments would agree to submit to such a tribunal." It would seem, then, that even if the Commissions finally succeed in setting up a tribunal, it will have nothing to arbitrate. That, precisely, is the view first stated in these pages when the Commissions were appointed. Calles will not submit to arbitration his right to loot American citizens. This Government cannot arbitrate the duty of American citizens to submit to pillage. At least two parties are necessary to a conference, but this conference will have not even one. Its utility, then, is at least doubtful.

Finally, the President expresses his great satisfaction in reporting that "the Mexican Ambassador has declared to me recently that Mexico does not intend to confiscate our property."

That same promise was made in the most solemn manner, in writing and under seal, not by an Ambassador, but by President Obregon, nearly four years ago. The President himself bears witness that the promise was shamelessly violated. What guarantee has been given for this new "promise"?

None whatever. Calles disowned the written promises made by Obregon. He will find no difficulty whatever in disowning the oral pledge of his Ambassador.

It is not surprising, then, to learn that Calles is "greatly pleased" with the President's address. The President states his principles well, but Calles will agree to any and all principles and promises provided he is not required to be faithful to them. To him all words are weasel words. The worst he has to fear is another "Note"

which he will answer at leisure in ambiguous terms, or another "Commission" which he is at liberty to disregard.

If the President is right in stating that every self-respecting Government is obliged to protect the rights of its citizens wherever they may be, either this Government understands "rights" in a Pickwickian sense, or it is no longer self-respecting.

#### Catholics and the Public School

**A**N aftermath of a controversy which recently drew the attention of the entire country is the increased space given by metropolitan journals to "Letters From Correspondents." Several writers who aver that they are Catholics, or even "good Catholics"—a presumption which makes the judicious shudder—have written to state that "Catholics are not forbidden to attend the public schools."

These writers may be Catholics, but they are not well-informed Catholics.

The law of the Church is so plain that it cannot possibly be misunderstood. "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral, or mixed schools; that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics," is the language of Canon 1374 of the Code. "It is for the Bishop of the place alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Holy See, in what circumstances, and with what precautions, attendance at such schools may be tolerated without danger of perversion to the pupils."

Obviously, then, it is untrue to write that "Catholics are not forbidden to attend the public schools."

This law was not enacted, of course, as an attack upon the public school, as it is found in the United States. It existed, in substance, long before the rise of the American public school, and it binds Catholics all over the world. It is, rather, an expression of the Church's duty to impress upon parents the seriousness of their obligation to train their children in religion, and to shield them from whatever might weaken that training. It is no secret, surely, that in the mind of the Catholic Church, there is no human activity from which Almighty God may be rightly excluded, and least of all from the education of the child. Nor is it a secret, whispered only among the initiate, that the most crying need of the State today is a rising generation imbued with a practical respect for religion and morality, but, rather, a fact shouted from the housetops by educators and jurists who are Catholics neither in creed nor in sympathies. But where others preach, the Catholic Church acts. Believing in Almighty God, His law and His revelation, believing, too, in the supreme importance of religion as an energizing and uplifting force in the life of every man, she directs, first, that the child be trained from his earliest years in religion and morality, and next, that he be protected from the effects of an educational system which, in the words of the Protestant Dr. Weigle of Yale, by ignoring religion "conveys the suggestion that religion is without truth or value."

It need hardly be said that Catholics are organizing

no dark-lantern plot against the welfare of the public school. Their opposition is in the open, for all to see, and it is based upon philosophical and altruistic as well as upon religious grounds. They entertain no project of crippling the public schools, or of evading the financial burdens placed upon them by these institutions. At the same time, they have no idea whatever of accepting devotion to the public school as a test of their patriotism.

One might as well make the test devotion to the county court. Like the county court the public school is a State, not a Federal, creation, and an institution which may be revised by the people, or amended, or abolished, as they see fit. This country went its way—and it was not an inglorious way—for many years without the benefits of a secularized school system. The time may come when its people will decree a return to schools which, like the schools in which the Fathers of this Republic were for the most part trained, recognized the rights of God in the education of the child.

#### A Catholic in the White House

**I**N a recent magazine article, Mr. Meredith Nicholson, of Indiana, invites all Catholic candidates for the Presidency to withdraw. Even should one of the great parties nominate a Catholic, he fears that the ensuing campaign would develop a bitterness much like that of a civil war.

As he has shown on many occasions, Mr. Nicholson is no bigot. He pens his invitation, he writes, with a sense of shame. What is to be thought of his proposal?

This Review observed some three years ago, after the hurly-burly of the Democratic National Convention had subsided into comparative sanity, that Catholics could see no particular advantage in having one of their number President of the United States. It repeats that observation now. There is nothing that Catholics could ask from a Catholic in the White House that they would not demand from a Jew, a Methodist or an atheist, for all they wish is a fair field and no favor.

Why, then, if Catholics have nothing to gain from a Catholic President, should not some Catholic body authoritatively approve Mr. Nicholson's suggestion?

The case is not so simple. Catholics, as a body, have never taken part in a political campaign, and have sedulously avoided anything like the formation of a Catholic party. It is not wise to abandon that policy.

In the next place, such an approbation would be equivalent to an approval by Catholics of a religious test for Federal office.

Putting the matter in another way, Catholics would do what the framers of the Constitution carefully avoided doing.

In our judgment, Mr. Nicholson's well-meant plan is not only an invitation to bigotry to go a little further, but an attack upon the Constitution itself. We like the idea of requesting a Catholic to cede a constitutional right, simply because he is a Catholic, as little as we like the idea of asking a Methodist to withdraw simply because he is a Methodist.

## Jail, the Padlock and the Stage

**A**S was remarked a few weeks ago, "art" as it is understood on the New York stage, has fallen upon evil times. Half a dozen artists have just completed sentences in the county jail, and others await the action of the courts in fear and trembling. What promised to be a huge farce played at the expense of the law, has ended in something very like a tragedy. At the time of his arrest one of the artists had completed preparations to stage a highly offensive production, banned by the authorities in another city. For a few days he basked in the spotlight of publicity and laughed the threats of the District Attorney to scorn. He has since experienced a change of heart. He has dropped the production, and it is reported that with him a dozen managers along Broadway are beginning to realize some kinds of publicity are too costly.

It is to be hoped that the city officials will not yield to the temptation of thinking that they can now afford to relax their efforts. As it seems to us, there is only one way of dealing with these vultures, and that is by fining them heavily and sending them to jail. A fine alone may be taken up by the advertising department, but no one can serve a jail sentence by proxy. If both punishments are inflicted to the limit of the law, the modern debasers of the stage may some day learn that the business of purveying to impropriety does not pay. But one lesson is not enough. For a few years, at least, the authorities must display their full energy and zeal.

To add to the discomfiture of Broadway, Governor Smith has signed the so-called "padlock law." This statute does not operate by summary process, as was claimed by some managers, but provides that after a conviction has been secured, the theatre premises may be closed for as long a period as one year. The theory that the owner, or his responsible agents ought to know the uses to which his property is put, is thoroughly sound. If there are property rights, there are also property responsibilities. "I didn't know" is a plea that has been invoked not only to excuse the exploitation of vice but also the exploitation of the worker by heartless capitalists. Owners are obliged in conscience, according to the Catholic view, so to use their property that it will do no harm to themselves, to their fellows, or to the community.

One may deeply regret that the long-overdue house-cleaning in New York was not undertaken by the managers and the actors themselves. Opposition was to be expected from the owners and the managers, but some of the actors' associations emerge from the conflict with very little credit. If the actors can strike to secure decent wages and decent working-conditions, we do not see why they refuse to strike in defense of their right to decline to take part in indecent plays. No doubt this opposition would impose some hardship, at least for a time. But in every walk of life, to be loyal to what is true and good and noble will at times demand even greater sacrifices. Lying and rapine and theft cannot be excused on the ground that honor sometimes calls for a fortitude that is superhuman. When we admit that plea we say farewell to decency and to civilization.

## How Protestant Is This Country?

**T**HE religious estimates annually issued by the Rev. H. K. Carroll, are always interesting, even though Dr. Carroll will not concede to us Catholics the poor privilege of deciding what is meant by membership in the Catholic Church. In our view, the mewling infant who has just lustily expressed his disapprobation of the waters poured upon him in Holy Baptism is quite as truly a Catholic as is the Bishop of Rome. But this Dr. Carroll will not allow. His method is to take the statistics, presumably as returned, and in the case of Catholics to deduct fifteen per cent. As he gives warning, however, no great harm is done, and the Catholic can find a little mental exercise in solving the problem "If X equals 85 per cent. what does 100 per cent. equal?"

But the statement that "this is a Protestant country" finds no proof in Dr. Carroll's tables, which, indeed, tell a sad story. Out of a population estimated in 1925 by the Bureau of the Census at 113,493,720, only about 47,500,000 are affiliated with any religious body of any kind. Of this religious group Catholics number—according to Dr. Carroll—16,193,171. Jews, Quakers, and the various Oriental Churches bring this number to about 20,000,000.

In the final estimate, then, it would seem that approximately 27,500,000 Americans are Protestants and 87,993,720 Americans are not Protestants. This total would not indicate that the United States is a Protestant country.

We take no particular pleasure in noting that thousands of non-Catholics are falling away from a belief in God and the authority of His law to indifferentism or atheism. Once this was in fact a Christian country. Today of every 100 Americans sixty have no connection, even nominal, with any Christian organization.

## Should John Go to College?

**T**HE President of Brown joins the Presidents of Yale and Michigan in complaining that far too many young men are "sent" to college. About half of them, he thinks, would do better in a mercantile career.

While we have no study of this problem which inspires confidence, it is clear that a respectable number of college administrators feel that Dr. Faunce is right. Why, then, cannot the colleges, or better, every college for itself, take effective means to exclude the undesirable element?

Time was when the smaller institutions let the academic gates swing wide. They needed, or thought they needed, the "prestige" as well as the income that only a large number of students could give. But today the majority of our colleges have far more applicants than they can receive.

The manufacturer's first care is good material to work with. It should be the college's. If an applicant is not in earnest, he should be rejected. But earnestness alone is not sufficient. The candidate should be required to show that he can profit by what the college offers.

Every college should be able to distinguish wheat from chaff without great difficulty. Perhaps it can. But too often it tries to believe that it can change the chaff into wheat. That delusion is costly.

## Woman and the Catholic Church

GRACE HAUSMANN SHERWOOD

THE restlessness of women everywhere today, their restiveness under the very real yoke which Nature itself has laid upon them, makes but scant appeal to the Catholic woman who understands her Faith and knows something of its history.

Not that the Catholic woman cannot be a feminist, for she often is one and with reason. Many of the great women saints, Hilda the abbess, Catherine of Sienna, St. Theresa, to mention only three, were feminists if feminism means proving that intellect, courage, ability, vision, holiness, any great quality, can be the dower of women as well as of men. Indeed our latest Saint, Ste. Jeanne D'Arc, is the very embodiment of feminism. "There are enough to cook and to sew," she insists as she sallies forth on the high adventure of saving her country! The most advanced feminist of today could hardly find a larger work—or a more modern slogan.

But leaving feminism aside, leaving, even, the saints aside, the Catholic woman can go back to Mary and rest content in her alone. Wise and just and holy men have walked the earth in countless thousands since her time but the Virgin of Nazareth shines out in her sinlessness above them all. And the wisest and the holiest of men have always been the readiest to proclaim her eminence, have always loved her most. Therefore, to be born a woman means to belong to that division of the human family which God Himself crowned, signally, with honor. One of us, not one of our brothers, was immaculate.

I like to think of the Blessed Virgin in the very first days after the Great Secret was revealed to her and to her alone of all created beings. Men call women garrulous and say, openly, that they cannot keep a secret; but it seems God thinks otherwise. There were priests in the temple on that spring day long ago, disputing at that very moment, probably, the time and the place of the Messiah's coming. They were left to their disputations in the very temple that her Child's coming would cause to fall, presently, about their ears while she, a simple girl, was chosen to share, with the Most High, the knowledge that the Redeemer was come at last.

She had an espoused husband and according to the custom of the times and the custom of the country where she lived what concerned his wife was much more his affair than it was hers. But the angel did not appear to Joseph until afterwards and then merely to restore his peace of mind. His consent was not asked and, everlasting refutation of the slander that a woman cannot keep a secret, Mary did not tell him. She knew, with shining clarity, that this thing which was to happen to her was something between her soul and its Creator

alone, a thing high above the ordinary duty a Jewish woman owed her husband.

Meanwhile the priests disputed on in the temple that would soon be no more . . . . kings on their thrones meditated laws for kingdoms that would, presently, vanish from the earth . . . . rich men and poor went their ways of barter and exchange, crowding the shops and streets as they crowd them today. Yet Mary betook herself to none of these busy and important ones of earth. Instead, she traveled far, in haste, we are told, to another woman, her cousin, occupied only with the business of their sex.

It was to Elizabeth that the actual presence of the Messiah upon earth was first revealed. It would seem that Zachary, her husband, being a high priest, was entitled to the revelation rather than she, but *his* faith had not been equal to what was imposed upon it. Stricken dumb for his incredulity he was forced to sit in silence while his wife and her cousin spoke together of the holy things of God.

To me, a woman, it has always been hard to choose between the sublimity of Elizabeth's prophetic greeting and the joyous poetry of Mary's reply. No wonder the Church, with unerring wisdom, has incorporated them both into her liturgy, to move the souls of worshipers. What woman with a spark of imagination could sit in church unmoved while the sublime words of the Ave Maria are being said or sung. Or hear the Magnificat without crying out in her heart, also, "My soul doth magnify the Lord. . . . He hath regarded the humility of His handmaid. . . . He hath exalted the humble."

The Church has always insisted on this new dignity of woman under the Christian dispensation. Not only in her liturgy but in her laws. Inch by inch, century after century, she has fought valiantly for the integrity of the souls of her daughters; against polygamy and concubinage and divorce and all the other lustful devices of man to supplant her in her rightful supremacy as his only lawful mate; against the evils of serfdom and slavery; against the laws of the land which deprived her of the right to dispose of her person as she saw fit. Woman, the slave and chattel of paganism, has always been honored by the Church: her laws have always striven to protect her. No one can doubt it who reads. It stands out as clearly from the pages of even such a biased historian as Guizot as it does from the decrees of the Councils. Not only has the Church set the ideal of the Perfect Woman before men's eyes, she has raised all women from the darkness and the misery of pre-Christian times.

No wonder the Church has been the friend of women.

Our Lord Himself was, always. His first miracle was a gracious answer to a sympathetic and tactful woman's request; performed to set at rest the mind of His mother who, like all women who are worthy of the name, sympathized with her friends and made their possible dilemma her affair as well as theirs.

Jesus chose men for His Apostles and Disciples. He lived with them by day and slept with them by night. *They* knew the exquisite joy of His companionship, *they* had the treasure of His love. And yet in the dark hours of His crucifixion, in spite of all the time He had spent with them, teaching them, training them, ordaining them for His service, in spite, even, of that last supreme gift of His, that first Holy Communion which no woman, not even His mother, perhaps, was permitted to share, not one of these, His dearest, dared to defend Him.

We are accustomed to attribute bravery to men, bravery and independence of thought; but in all the tumult of cries and slanders and mockery and abuse that accompanied His trial there was only one voiced raised in His defence, the voice of a woman, the wife of Pontius Pilate. Clear and stirring it comes down the centuries. "Have nothing to do with this just man" she warned, nobly, alone, amidst the cruelty and treachery and craven weakness of men.

When the horror and grief of Calvary were over it was a woman whom Jesus chose to first gladden with the sight of His glorified face. A woman whom men, having made her what she was, spurned, the Magdalene who had learned perfectly to love Our Lord. Each takes her place in the beautiful Gospel story: The Virgin to whom the Redemption was revealed first, Claudia Procula, who alone defended His innocence, Mary Magdalene, who was first at the tomb. The purest, the ordinary, the worst of women, each emphasizes in her own way the new place woman was to occupy in the Christian religion.

Lastly, we come to her one great privilege, sanctified for all time by the Divine Maternity of Mary. After all, the supreme and abiding privilege of women is motherhood. All lesser privileges lead up to it or, to put it more exactly, exist because of it. Moreover, most of the work that women are happiest in doing is, when we examine it narrowly, some extension of motherhood.

Motherhood is more than parenthood. Men may, indeed, have sons and daughters. They may and do love them and labor for them. They can pass on to them their names and the wealth they have amassed for them. But the deep things of parenthood that women know are hidden from men. It is not given to *them* to make a temple of their bodies wherein the quickening breath of God may work out in secret and silence the mystery of life. It can never be theirs to walk beneath the stars and look up at them and think that out of your very being God is allowing you to help Him form one more soul to know and love Him forever. Yes, there are secret ways which women walk with God that men, with all their privileges, can never walk!

As there can be no privilege, no honor, even in a wordly

sense, without paying for it, so this privilege of motherhood has its price. Above the road to it is set the flaming sign of sacrifice. Everywhere upon it is to be found, suffering, toil, self-forgetfulness. Was any woman worthy of the name ever dismayed by that? Does any real woman ever regret she is a woman because of that? Rather, since we know that the way of self-sacrifice is the road to the purest joy earth can give ought we not rejoice that as women God has called us to the highest things He has to give: suffering and self-sacrifice. The answer of the Blessed Virgin to the heavenly messenger finds an echo in every truly Catholic woman's heart: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Be it done unto me according to thy word!"

### Those Prohibitionists

GEORGE BARNARD

CONSIDER the intemperance of the temperance advocates. Wade with me for a few minutes through a delightful mass of muddled argument which dropped into my mail box a few moments ago to lighten a dull evening.

There is no telling who sponsored it but it consists of two leaflets of American origin, a leaflet imprinted with the very full title of The Temperance Council of the Christian Churches of England and Wales; a folder of doubtful (but probably American) pedigree and a copy of the January number of that sprightly Chicago journal the *Father Matthew Man* which carries a front page slogan "Excommunicate the Bootlegger." Such an appeal to me is wasted. I have no jurisdiction in the matter. Perhaps it is addressed to the Pope, in which case it seems a very curious way of petitioning His Holiness, but as there is on page 2 a request to the Pontiff and the Sacred College to "take on" total abstinence, perhaps it is the way things are done in total abstinence circles. I do not know. I do not move in them.

I am not concerning myself here with the disadvantages or the advantages of alcohol. There are many. What interests me and what tends to unsettle the little sympathy which I had for temperance reformers, is the very questionable means which they adopt to present their case.

Take for example the folder of probable American origin. It begins in large type

#### THE CATHOLIC CHURCH THE GREAT PROHIBITION CHURCH

There follow a list of twenty-seven prohibitions, such as these: "Catholics are prohibited from staying away from Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation"; "Catholics are prohibited from coveting their neighbors' wives or property"; "Catholics are prohibited from being disobedient to their parents or superiors."

The man who takes his literature in headlines may have gathered the impression, without reading further, that the Catholic Church favors prohibition. He may on this evidence pass along the argument to his friends. He knows the Catholic Church is in favor of prohibition be-

cause he has seen it in print. If he were to persevere to the end of the list he would find this specious reasoning:

The prohibitions of the Catholic Church are not arguments either for, nor (*sic*) against, the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic; but they do show the principle of prohibition is correct, and he who says it is not, is simply bumping his head against the Rock of Peter.

But the bump is so slight as to be hardly noticeable. The Church has not declared against liquor. It has always encouraged temperance, in beverage-liquor, in language, recreation and everything else provided for our common enjoyment. The "prohibitions" of the Church have nothing in common with the prohibition of liquor. When the Church says that Christians may not covet their neighbors' wives and property, it does not prevent neighbors from having wives and property in order to remove the temptation. When the Church says that Christians may not be disobedient to their parents or superiors it does not say there shall be no one in the position of a parent or a superior. And when the Church says it is sinful to drink or eat to excess, or to speak intemperately, it does not say that wine must not circulate, nor food be bought and sold; neither does it enjoin silence.

To label the Catholic Church "The Great Prohibition Church", putting a special sense upon the word "prohibition" in a temperance campaign is, in my humble judgment, not quite the sort of thing one feels one has a right to expect from people who, finding the world bad, appoint themselves its reformers.

Take another tract. The dragon created for slaying is the statement attributed to the drink trade: "The strongest argument in favor of drink is 'I like it.'" The response is made by a series of counter arguments ending in black type with the gleeful exclamation "Do You Like That?" Here is a specimen:

Despite the fact that there were 1,166,000 persons on the unemployment registers in December, 1925, Great Britain spent £315,000,000 on Drink. Do You Like That?

The answer is that I do not. But I cannot see that the closing of the distilleries and breweries and saloons and wine shops would improve the unemployment question. It is never suggested in Great Britain that men are unemployed because they drink. There is no work for them to do, and to close another industry would add many thousands to the ranks of the unemployed. I do not complain that this particular specimen is unfair propaganda. It is simply pointless, and hardly the sort of thing to prove that all the intellect is on the side of the temperance reformers—as the leaflet claims.

Another distressing fact which we are asked if we like is the statement by the British Home Secretary "I have found that Drink is at the bottom of an enormous proportion of crime." And this leads us on to *The Father Mathew Man* which declares its position by saying it prefers "the teaching of the Scriptures to the somber and contradictory lugubrious of unscientific theorists, holds that before sin there was no alcohol on the earth, and that hard labor, sickness and death came as a result

of sin." When considering the statement that "an enormous proportion of crime" results from alcohol it is worth remembering that the first sin was a sober sin.

The article under notice is on "The Origin of Alcohol" and it seeks to show, in a manner which I cannot follow, that before sin came "fruits and plants . . . dried up, instead of rotting, decomposing and producing alcohol." Corruption and fermentation, it is stated specifically, came after sin. Many things which came after sin are not necessarily bad, and to take that line of argument leads one to condemn a good many articles of harmless pleasure and profit. But the argument might easily trap the unwary. Alcohol taken internally, this special pleader argues "prepares, miasma-like, spawning grounds for the generating of physical disorders and of moral degeneracy." There is no solid medical opinion in favor of this gloomy outlook; but that does not deter the editress from giving a pontifical pronouncement upon the subject. How all this can be based on the teaching of the Scriptures upon which this paper takes its stand is not patent.

Another example of intemperance in this little publication is its one-sided method of presenting outside opinions on its special subject. Some priests have written seemingly in favor of prohibition. Their opinions are printed under the very proper headline, "Theologians on Prohibition." But other priests, equally renowned, have ventured to render a contrary opinion on the validity of the total suppression of the beverage liquor traffic. Their views are given under the heading "As others see us." Rev. J. Keating, S.J., a very eminent theologian, and Editor of the *Month*, becomes one of the "Others" because his opinion is not acceptable to the editress. Further, Father Keating's opinion that prohibition is a shameful admission of the general inability to apply moral checks to indulgence, is presented with a comment upon his "peevish intolerance and brazen impudence." And his New York brethren, one learns, "are not much more considerate, though [it is gratifying to hear] more prudent in utterance."

I often feel disposed to eschew alcohol, but my resolution flies when I light upon temperance tracts. They are so bitterly partial that one is forced to a comparison between the state of mind of their authors and the balance which one meets amongst one's common liquor-imbibing associates who observe some sense of proportion in an argument. Whilst Father Keating, a world-famed editor, has "peevish intolerance and brazen impudence" to run counter to the opinion of the lady who guides the little quarterly published in Chicago, Cardinal Mercier, who had different views, becomes "gentle and strong; the modern John the Baptist; *the greatest figure in contemporary history* [including the italics]; the greatest saint since Francis de Sales."

Another of the tracts looks to me rather like blasphemy. It appears to bump up against the Rock of Peter much more violently than does the man who says sincerely in his simple heart that the principle of prohibition is wrong. But what's the use . . .

## Debating the Mexican Question

CHARLES PHILLIPS

IS the public of the United States interested in the religious situation in Mexico? Or does it interest Catholics only? As it happens, during the months that I have been watching, almost in vain, for public opinion on Mexico expressed in the papers, I have had another means of gauging popular interest in the situation—the lecture platform. And the lecture platform (or rather the lecture hall: the audience) has quite a different story to tell. If one were to judge public interest in the Mexican problem, and specifically in the religious problem of Mexico, by the lecture-forum, rather than by the press-forum, then one would be forced to admit that the people of this country are interested, and interested in a very lively manner, in Mexico and her doings.

I say "the people of this country," because I have taken measure of the thing in a city which will, I think, be accepted both by reason of its size and its make-up as fairly representative: Chicago. During the past winter I have participated in five "lecture debates" in Chicago, and in every case the hall or theater was filled and the audiences were, with but one exception, decidedly "lively."

It all began with an evening at the Auditorium Hotel. That first lecture was what might be called a "straight" lecture; that is, there was no other speaker on the platform, no other debater. But there was a debate. At the close of the lecture I offered to answer questions. Then the fun began; and it began in such good earnest and it lasted so long that the outcome of it was a schedule of debates arranged by the Chicago Open Forum which, in the aggregate, attracted between three and four thousand people and which extended well over the winter months.

The debates were held in the Erlanger Theater, in the First Methodist Church (Evanston), in the Jewish Temple, and in the Union League Club. The last named debate brought out an audience of about four hundred, but it was the only audience that for various reasons did not ask questions from the floor, although individuals did come up afterwards for information.

The largest audience was that gathered one Sunday afternoon in the Erlanger Theater. Huge posters advertised the debate, and a mixed crowd came, made up, as the director of the Open Forum told me, not alone of Forum subscribers, but of what he termed "miscellaneous" auditors. This audience, I felt, was at first slightly antagonistic to the Catholic speaker. My opponent, the Rev. Alva Taylor, a prominent Methodist divine of Indianapolis, had formerly had a church in Chicago, and many of his old friends were there. What Dr. Taylor said, always in a courteous manner, seemed to satisfy his hearers, in spite of the fact that he spoke only in generali-

ties and more from hearsay, apparently, than from observation, although he was just recently returned from Mexico. It was thus a rather complacent if not an antagonistic audience that I faced when he had done.

There is a curiously electrifying thing that happens to public speakers at times, when the attitude of an audience changes; when the audience "sits up." As luck would have it, I was able, in refuting a statement of Dr. Taylor's, to remember the full name of a certain person in Mexico City whom he had quoted, but to whom he had referred in a way which, although nameless and indefinite, gave me the key to his identity. "That man," I said, "was Rev. Father Mariano Cuevas, the Jesuit historian. Father Cuevas's writings are published and may be read, and no such statement can be found in them. Moreover, anyone who knows the man knows him to be incapable of such a statement." From the moment I said this, the complacency of the audience changed to interest. When the time for questions arrived, the people were ready to bombard us both.

What sort of questions were asked at these Forum debates? To begin with, the questions were nearly always intelligent and to the point. There were, of course, a few of the inevitable foolish questions, coming either from cranks who wished to make a little lecture of their own on Pacifism or Militarism, or from the genus floating-radical who haunts such public meetings. From the stage the speaker could invariably recognize the type—over-eager, nervous, a bit malicious, fanatical. "Are you speaking for the Pope or for Oil?" "Why are Catholic countries always poor and always dirty?" "Is the Catholic Church trying to get us into another war?" But there was not much of this sort of thing.

One of the best questions asked (by the President of a well-known life-insurance company) was this: "If the Church was satisfied with government control under the regime of Church and State, why does it object to government control under the Republic?" The answer was obvious, and I hope satisfied more than the questioner. No matter, what restrictions the Church may have suffered under the regime of union of Church and State, at least the rights of the Church to teach and preach were recognized and protected by the State. Under the present "Constitution" of Mexico, not only are these rights repudiated and annulled, but the very existence of the Church as having a juristic personality is denied. The present Government of Mexico desires, not the separation of Church and State, but the absolute subjection of the Church to this State.

"Why is the Church opposed to secular education?" What the Church is opposed to is the *secularization* of

education; the making it impossible to supplement secular education with religious training of any kind, either in schools, in churches, or even in the home—since even the home is invaded, when the Church and the priesthood, the chief sources of religious teaching, are destroyed.

No "decisions" were given at these debates. But it was curious how the feeling of the audience could be measured not only by the nature of its questions, but by their direction. The speaker whom the auditors most opposed was always the speaker most questioned. And here a word ought to be said for the fairness of my opponents, and especially of Rev. Dr. Hubert Herring, of Boston, Chairman of the Social Service Commission of the Congregational Churches. More than once in the two debates I had with Dr. Herring, when he had been quizzed, he would finish by inviting his Catholic opponent to add or refute as he wished.

Strangely enough, the audience which I expected to be most unsympathetic—at the Jewish Temple—proved to be quite the contrary; a condition due, perhaps, to the fact that the Jewish people (as I reminded them) were peculiarly fitted to sympathize with the victims of religious persecution. The Temple audience went rather hard after Dr. Herring; but his answers were invariably courteous and fair; as for example: "How did the Church come to possess property in Mexico?" "Through the offerings of the rich and the poor." A Catholic could not give a better answer. But, as it happened, Dr. Herring's answer in this case did not satisfy his auditor, who was a rather pertinacious member of the Anshe Emes Congregation, planted square in the front pew, right under the speaker's nose. "Well then," she finished, "do you think it fair to take that property away from them?"

One thing in the favor of the Catholic speaker was that, in every case, his opponents, championing the Calles side of the argument, seemed to lack conviction. They conceded much; they paid tribute to the Church for the good it had done; they gave sympathetic descriptions of Mexican religious ceremonies. On the whole, I think their attitude could be summed up thus, and perhaps in this attitude they may be taken as representatives of non-Catholic opinion on the matter: They are sincerely and immediately concerned with the social-reform side of the question, and they regard the Church as too conservative and as, in the past at any rate, the enemy of social reform. They know very little of the history of the Catholic social effort in Mexico and less of the culpability of the anti-Catholic revolutionary Governments that have blocked the Church in her work, torn down what she has built up, and left the country in the mess in which we find it today. At the same time they appear to have no appreciation whatsoever of the danger to democratic institutions which threaten in the disruptive policies of Calles, Morones and the like.

Next to the attitude of the Protestant debaters, a second point in favor of the Catholic speaker was this: Over against the at times almost neutral stand of my opponents, I always took the ground and stated the fact

that I was in no way an official spokesman for the Catholic Church; that it was rather as an American citizen that I was primarily interested in the Mexican situation; and that it was because the so-called Constitution of Mexico violates every ideal and principle that Americans cherish that I condemned it and challenged any American to defend it. I could feel the audiences respond to that, every time. Again, when historical references were made, I quoted almost entirely from non-Catholic authorities; and I quoted verbatim and by page and line. I used the words of Protestant ministers in defense of Christian education and, in the case of the Jewish Temple debate, had at hand, in defense of Bishop Diaz, the words of the Rabbi who accompanied Dr. Herring to Mexico to investigate the situation. The point is, our audiences gave every sign of appreciating fair play; one man wrote me a letter afterward, complimenting both sides for what he termed their "good manners."

Humor got into the debates more than once; as when a Methodist lady, taking up my point as to the reduction of the number of ministers of all creeds, asked Dr. Herring if that would mean that there could be only one Methodist preacher for each seven thousand Methodists? "Madam," Dr. Herring replied, "it would be impossible to round up seven thousand Methodists in Mexico." The audience (at Temple Anshe Emes) seemed to enjoy that. And this reminds me of a significant remark Dr. Herring made to our Evanston audience. "Mexico," he said, "does not want Protestantism. Protestantism is too cold for the Mexican nature. What Mexico wants is a religion born out of the old Church." At another meeting Dr. Herring said, "If I were a Catholic in Mexico today, I'd be fighting mad, too!"

There was drama, too, as well as humor; and the audience responded heartily to the dramatic. At the Erlanger Theater the burden of Dr. Taylor's argument was that there is not, really, a Church persecution going on in Mexico. He referred to it always as "the so-called persecution." At the close of my argument, the Mexican Consul, Señor Luis Lupian, stood up, very conspicuously, in a box, and asked in a rather insinuating manner just what I considered the cause of the persecution of the Church in Mexico? I rose; and I enjoyed then that curious sensation that public speakers sometimes experience, as of a dual personality; as of hearing oneself like another person speaking. "Is the question," I asked, "what is the cause of the persecution of the Church in Mexico?" Señor Lupian, still standing in the box, now with all eyes riveted on him, promptly answered "Yes." "Then the Honorable Consul from Mexico, to begin with, admits that there is a persecution of the Church?"

There was a second's silence. Then the consul had to answer; and he had to answer "Yes." As he sat, the audience . . . well, the audience laughed at him. I felt sorry for him. Perhaps he did not understand English perfectly. But at any rate, he had made, even though unwillingly and unwittingly, a public statement before a metropolitan audience that gave the lie outright to his

Government's propaganda. He did not appear at any of the later debates; but I feel pretty sure that the outcome of his first appearance served to increase public interest in the question—and to add considerably to the size of our subsequent audiences.

These few notes on my experiences on the lecture platform during the past winter will serve, I trust, to give some insight into the matter of public interest in Mexico's religious problem. The public is interested; at any rate, a representative portion of the public is interested enough to come out and face even inclement weather to hear the question discussed.

### Techny Retreats

BRUNO HAGSPIEL, S.V.D.

**S**UMMER retreats at Techny, Illinois, under the auspices of the Fathers of the Society of the Divine Word, were established in the year 1906, and have been held every year continuously since then. The rule of the Society makes it incumbent upon every mission house within its jurisdiction to open its doors for all such as may desire to devote a certain period of time for spiritual retirement and devotion.

Shortly after the founding of the Society of the Divine Word by Father Arnold Janssen at Steyl, Holland (it was during the *Kulturkampf*), the Most Reverend Paul Melchers, Archbishop of Cologne, who was at the time in exile, wrote to Father Janssen, deplored the fact that political conditions in the country had made it practically impossible to provide for any assembly of German priests, for retreat, for some years past. He appealed to the founder of the new mission society to make arrangements so that the priests of the archdiocese of Cologne could come together at the Steyl mission house for a period of spiritual withdrawal from the world.

This appeal was the immediate incentive for the incorporation of the retreat work as a part and parcel of the fundamental purposes of the Society. Retreats for laity as well as priests were almost immediately opened, and in this way the Society of the Divine Word became the forerunner in Central Europe for the whole vast movement which has now spread far and wide. So great has been the success of the retreats in the Steyl Mother House that upwards of seven thousand retreatants (both men and women) have been received there during a single summer season. The congregation of Missionary Sisters, Servants of the Holy Ghost (also founded by Father Janssen), everywhere cooperate with the S.V.D. Fathers in forwarding the retreat movement, making every provision for the housing of women retreatants and the procuring for them the same spiritual privileges that are to be had by men at the S.V.D. houses.

Since 1877, retreats in the Steyl Mother House have been given every year, with the exception of the war years, 1915 to 1920. Statistics to within the last two years show that, altogether, 8,149 priests and 46,257 laymen have made retreats there. As for the women, 56-

336 have made retreats at the Steyl Mother House of the Missionary Sisters. Thus, up to the year 1926, Steyl had in all accommodated 110,742 retreatants.

These considerations form the proper background for the retreat work of the Techny Fathers in this country. Particularly in the Middle West have they, time and again, been hailed as the pioneers of this movement; but they themselves do not insist on the fact. Moreover, they have called retreatants to Techny from all quarters of the country and from all classes and professions among the people. However, of late years the same work has been taken up and carried forward with most notable success by others: witness the famous retreats (for men) of the Franciscan Fathers at Mayslake, Hinsdale, Illinois, near Chicago; and those (for women) at the Chicago Cenacle.

Techny summer retreats are given in English, in German, and in Polish. The total retreat attendance at Techny since the movement was inaugurated in 1906 has been, approximately, 4,000.

Perhaps the most characteristic and distinguishing feature of the Techny retreats is the fact that they are, invariably, strictly *closed* retreats, in the fullest meaning of the term—that is to say that strict silence is observed throughout. Several places of retreats have refrained from making this strict prescription hitherto, for fear of frightening away prospective retreatants; but in Techny the resolution to observe strict silence is looked upon as the crowning discipline of the period of withdrawal and is evidently greatly cherished as a precious thing in the minds of the throngs who gather there in yearly increasing numbers for the assigned periods of devotion and recollection. In fact, the Techny Fathers themselves firmly hold to the principle that a genuine retreat, in the best sense of the word, may not be had without this stipulation of entirely shutting out the world and all human intercourse of a social nature during the time that the spiritual exercises are being made.

Provision for a private room for each retreatant is held as the ideal for the carrying on of the work as it ought to be. But thus far demands have been so numerous and insistent upon both Fathers and Sisters at Techny that it has been impossible to maintain this great desideratum for all who have applied for admission. Each year, however, increased accommodations of this sort have been provided.

To the annual retreat folder for the Techny Retreats for the summer of 1927, which gives the dates of the English, German, Polish retreats, are added the following directions:

#### SPECIAL REMARKS CONCERNING THE TECHNY RETREATS

1. Retreats begin on Thursdays, at 7:30 p. m., and close on Sunday morning.

2. Convenient suburban trains on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul R. R. leave the Union Station, Chicago, many times during the day. Retreatants from Milwaukee and beyond may leave Milwaukee for Techny from the Union Station or from the North Shore Terminal. In the latter case the North Shore Bus, from Highland Park, Ill., provides transportation direct to the

Mission House at Techny. Techny is located on the Waukegan Road (Route 42A), twenty miles north of the Chicago Loop, and sixty miles south of Milwaukee.

3. The registration fee is \$10. This amount pays for all expenses while at Techny, including room and board. Due to added facilities provided by the new St. Mary's Guest House, about thirty more private rooms than were to be had in former years are now available. The registration is paid upon the arrival of the retreatant, and it is positively forbidden to any one to make any other collection whatever from any retreatant, for any purpose whatever, while the retreatant remains at Techny.

4. It is requested that applications for the retreats will be sent in early, with an indication as to the particular retreat it is considered desirable to attend. Men should address applications to the Retreat Department, St. Mary's Mission House, Techny, Illinois; and women should write to St. Ann's Home, Techny, Illinois.

Time and again the suggestion has been made to the Techny Fathers to establish a year-around retreat house; but up to the present hour the way has not opened for this. In fact, the year-around retreat house should be a distinct institution of its kind, marked off quite decidedly on several points from the special summer retreats as carried on at Techny. To these latter there is given a certain peculiarly missionary impetus; and this spirit is considerably augmented and emphasized by the Techny Father assigned for the Retreat Master: this Father is almost invariably a priest who is engaged for the remainder of the year in training candidates and recruits for the missionary priesthood in the Society of the Divine Word, and for future labors in the vast mission fields of the Society in the Far East and South Seas.

Thus the Society of the Divine Word, although notably a foreign missionary society, has also home missionary interests of vital importance especially at heart. The conduct of retreat work among Catholics within reach of their training colleges has been incorporated into the very structure of their organization as an integral part of their labors.

### Cameos For May

ELLA M. E. FLICK

THOUGH only a very little girl, she has all the bearing of a queen. As she walks she turns neither to the right nor to the left. She glances not backward at dear faces, when she mounts the steps that lead to the temple. The fire of Divine love beams from her eye. Upon her face is the radiance of a Divine ecstasy.

Where is she going, this little one so tender and so fair? Why has she left her home and her dear ones? She has consecrated her life to God. With the virgins, she will sit and sing praises to her Lord. Away from the world and its pleasures she will learn to serve her Creator all the days of her life. Beauty is in her face and form. Grace, such as no child of earth ever had, is hers. From her eyes the light of heaven looks out. Onward and upward she goes to the temple to sit with the virgins.

Standing aside, her mother looks after her, feasts her eyes upon her, the little child who, until this day, was hers alone to care for, to clothe, to fondle. Who will

brush and smooth those glowing locks? Will other hands draw covers about her on chill windy nights? Will other eyes detect her baby wants? A generous mother she is, a loved servant of her Lord, and Mary's mother. Gladly, lovingly she gives up her child . . . but how small is her little maid!

How bravely she goes. At so tender an age heavenly dreams are calling her. With the virgins she will learn to serve her Lord. Her baby hands will learn to sew, to weave, to prepare all that is necessary for the temple. Her infant voice will sing the praises of her Creator. In that holy temple her young mind will apply itself to the study of the pages of Sacred Writ, learning of the great prophets and holy men of ages past, of the Messiah yet to be born. Her child hands, shaped to fondle a doll, are eager to be made ready to carry, if so God wills, the infant Christ. She would be happy to serve that Christ. She might wait upon Him, dress His baby form, carry Him and render small services to the one privileged to be His holy mother.

The scene changes. A maiden kneels in prayer. She is young, little more than a child. She is radiant as the stars in the heavens. In her chamber kneeling in prayer she communes with her God. From early years she has learned to serve Him. Her hands have made beautiful His dwelling place. Her heart and mind have dwelt upon the signs and promises about to be fulfilled. In the temple she has learned that a great day is dawning. The day of her childhood dreams is at hand.

At prayer she kneels pouring out her soul before her God. Modest, humble, reverent, she is a maiden at prayer. "A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon beneath her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars," "The glory of Jerusalem, the joy of Israel."

The Angel Gabriel came and stood beside the virgin maiden as she knelt in prayer. He came, a messenger from God on high, into the city of Galilee called Nazareth. He came bearing to the Blessed Virgin Mary the tidings which were to bring such glory to her and such joy to the world.

"Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women." Stranger words never fell upon a maiden's ear. She is affrighted. She does not yet understand the presence of the heavenly visitor. Within her simple soul, she ponders who may be this wondrous being and what may mean his so strange greeting.

"Fear not Mary," he replies to her questioning, "for thou hast found grace with God. Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and thou shalt bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus."

She has heard the message. She has seen the messenger. God waits upon her word. Mary makes her decision, fraught with stupendous consequences: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word."

The mother bends over her Child, a woman kneels in adoration before her Babe. In her eyes shines the light of motherhood. In her heart is mother love, such as this world has never known. A chill place perhaps is that humble abode in Nazareth. With Joseph, the foster

father of Jesus, she is alone with her Son. In a poor dwelling, Mary the Mother bends to the wants of her Child who is also her God. Those same hands that learned to sew and to serve that she might wait upon the mother of God have prepared what was necessary for her Babe, swaddling clothes to keep Him from the cold.

In that bleak, bare room, in poverty, in obscurity, in hiding from men, Mary the Mother lives unafraid. What of the world and its doings? In that humble cradle lies the Saviour of the Universe. Winter winds may blow, if blow they will. Men and women in Nazareth town may close their doors and turn away.

Across the threshold of that room falls the shadow of a cross—a sorrow beside which the petty sorrows of men are as if they were not! In her arms she holds Him, hidden away from all the world. His little arms must grow big if only to reach to places prepared on a cross. His tiny feet must become strong to travel the way to Calvary. His baby head must one day fit a crown, even though the crown of thorns. His eyes are witness to tears she sheds in secret over garments that must be lengthened, bringing nearer that dreadful day. His ears cannot but detect the break in the voice that croons His lullaby.

She is teaching the little Christ to walk—that one day He may walk the dolorous way. She is listening for His first whispered word—but hears with sorrow His cry: “I thirst.” Holding Him tightly clasped, she might well detect in the cruel night wind’s howling the echo of that cry of hate of later years: “Crucify Him . . . Crucify Him!”

#### AVE MARIA!

The cold blue marble of your eyes seems warmer now  
Than yesterday, Tall Lady, and your unmoving lips  
Are eager now to speak; your immaculate brow  
Is framed with candles slender as the fingertips  
That hold the lilies shadowing your quiet breast  
That seems almost to throb. . . . You are so near to me. . . .  
Your gilded robes are moving on the scented crest  
Of incense burning slowly to eternity,  
And reaching vainly to the lofty awfulness  
Above the clouds; above the stars and skies and all;  
Beyond the walls of worldly love and loveliness;  
Beyond unpillared heavens to the gold portal  
Of sanctuary where you are.

Here I may kneel

And talk to you, Fair Lady, while the unknowing winds  
Are tearing at my heart. Here I may know the feel  
Of tenderness and love; the sainted ways and kinds  
Of you, for I am flesh, though not stainless as you,  
And Christ, your Son.

And if men are unanswering

And cannot find the fair white lilies that you strew  
From heaven to earth, will you let me go gathering  
Them up again to place them at your unflowered shrine?  
And will you talk to me, Tall Lady, when the night  
Comes slowly? Will you reach your lovely hands to mine  
And lead me up the starlit ways of blue and white . . .  
Over the faltered edges . . . up beyond the skies  
To where you live, that I may know you smiling there  
As I have seen a smile soften your marble eyes  
And linger quietly like some forgotten prayer?

NORBERT ENGELS.

#### Sociology

#### Mothers Day in the Schools

JOHN WILTBYE

Far be it from me to add to the celebrations which our long-suffering teachers must now conduct. Often, I fear, they go through the exercises of Clean-Up-Day and Fire-Prevention Day and Toothbrush Day and sundry other days forced upon them by committees of eagerly-beaming reformers, with a gnashing of the teeth that nothing restrains, and inward feelings that only their dominant Fear of God can control. (I see by the journals that the vigilant Mayor of New York has even now suppressed a scheme for exhibiting the school children of that enterprising city under glass!) For, after all, while a school ought to be a center for good health and good citizenship and all that, many teachers think it should likewise be a center for good spelling and good reading—and the time allotted is short enough without further subtracting from it.

Hence I do not suggest that Mothers Day be marked by any special ceremonies in the class room, unless, indeed, the circumstances of a particular school make this possible without interfering with the ordinary schedule or adding to the burden of the teacher. But it seems to me that many of the advantages which AMERICA has praised from time to time, in connection with Mothers Day, can be doubly secured, if the attention of the pupils in our high schools and colleges is enlisted. This day which first sprang from the brain of a clever advertising agent, can be used to inculcate lessons of great social value, but the best place to inculcate them is in the hearts of the rising generation. The youngsters in the grammar grades, being scarcely beyond the carried-in-arms and toddling stage, have not yet begun to rise. For them—or most of them—an impromptu instruction on the Fourth Commandment, will suffice. To their older brothers and sisters in high school and college a more searching appeal can be made.

That a change has come over the ideals and habits of our growing boys and girls within the last generation, is, I think, undeniable. Some part of this change was inevitable, and I am not prepared to say that its every phase is for the worse. I have read somewhere, in Channing’s “History of the United States,” if I am not mistaken, that in 1790 three per cent of the people lived in the city and ninety-seven per cent in the rural districts—and between the backwoods and some of the towns of that day, the differences were not startling. This rural preponderance was maintained for 130 years, the Census of 1920 showing for the first time a larger number of city-dwellers. The trend toward the city began some thirty years ago, and in the opinion of students, it is likely to continue, unless some lure in the farm, now hidden, can be discovered. Only the poets see the beauty of the golden moon rising over the haycocks in the South Lot, but the boys and girls who raked the haycocks seem to find more beauty in the glow supplied by the City Light, Heat and Power Co. (Inc).

This shifting of the population has, of course, exercised a sharp influence on the organization of the home. While most clearly noted in our larger cities, the effects are observable in some degree even in smaller centers. Their tendency is to destroy the sufficiency of the home. The younger people no longer find it a place suitable for recreation; it is too small; its attractions cannot stand comparison with the moving-picture house, or the dance which is held—according to social station—in the dance hall down on Second Street, or the Louis XIV Room of the local Biltmore. The forces set in motion by the changed conditions to which I have alluded are wholly centrifugal, so that many so-called "homes" today are literally nothing but sleeping-quarters. Meals are taken in the restaurant of the apartment house, or a near-by cafeteria; and I have recently noticed advertisements in which certain metropolitan hotels scoff at the idea of social gatherings in the home! These are not the great hostleries, but establishments which in a business-like manner are trying to secure the "trade" of persons of moderate means by offering what seems to me very moderate rates.

Since the home is decreasing in its power to hold, it is not a matter for wonderment that the authority of parents over their children is also decreasing. If the home is not important, those who administer it lose in influence. In this fact, it seems to me, we find the source of much of the disorder noted among our young people today. Catholic philosophers and sociologists rightly look upon the family and the home as constituting a factor of the highest value to society. It is the small world in which the child must be trained in those habits which will later make him a good and useful worker in the larger world which lies beyond. But that small world is now dissolving, and with its passing the outlook for society grows darker.

After shipwreck, even a small plank is welcome, and it may be possible to find that plank in Mothers Day. Too many boys and girls in high school look upon fathers and mothers merely as sources of supply. I remember a youngster of five who once remarked—with that appalling truthfulness one often finds in the very young—that he loved daddy because he worked for him and mother because she gave him lots to eat. I hope he outgrows that philosophy. Some young people always retain it, with an altered terminology. Possibly our high schools and colleges can help the rising generation to understand its detestable, because unnatural, principles.

I see that at last I am falling to suggestions, but I offer them to college dows of all degree with a sense of my inferiority that is, I trust, both disarming and engaging.

A letter to mother that makes no mention, not even the remotest, of finances, but contains assurances of a love to be shown by the reception of Holy Communion for her, is, of course, most appropriate. But our erudite professors can set forth stores of useful instruction drawn from their respective fields of learning. Father is the head of the family; I admit that truth, and indeed insist upon it, for fear of the faggot; but mother is its heart, and as

far as authority and influence are practically concerned, I do not see why they may not be regarded as a single source. But the whole of Christian civilization has been built on the foundation of love of Jesus Christ—and of His Mother. Wherever you find Christ, from Bethlehem to Calvary, you find Him with Mary; and I am inclined to think that wherever you meet a man who shows forth Christ in his life, you can trace the influence of a woman who was like Mary, the Mother of Jesus.

Paganism looked upon woman as an inferior being, a tool or a toy; Christianity raised her to an equality with man as equally a child of God. It was not Christianity that taught fierce contempt of woman, but Gnosticism. Christianity brought the nations to their knees before Mary, the Mirror of spotless womanhood, the model of all pure motherhood. And Christianity must keep them there—Christianity with its principles of respect for womanhood, respect for chaste motherhood, and respect for authority.

### Education

#### The Nation's Fictitious Cornerstone

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

"THE Puritans burned witches."

"Lincoln declared war on the South to free the slaves."

Here are two statements that belong to the snows of history's yesteryear. It is highly probable that no "witch" was ever arraigned in New England, but even of the poor wretches executed not one was burned. And—to labor the obvious—Lincoln did not "declare war." Under the Constitution that power belongs not to the President, but to Congress. Lincoln called for volunteers after Fort Sumter had been fired on, and reported to Congress; and what he thought of the slave-question as related to the continuance of the war is plain from his letter to Greeley.

But errors die hard. Few of us now burn witches in Salem, but some of us still say that "the public school is the cornerstone of the Republic." Other some, among them Dr. Frank D. Boynton, superintendent of schools in Ithaca, New York, feel justified in writing, "At the birth of this Republic, the Fathers made clear their belief that in education alone lay security for popular government." (*Journal of the National Education Association*, April, 1927.)

As to the cornerstone charge, the phrase is somewhat vague, but I suppose it to mean much the same as "foundation." In that case, this Republic has no foundation, since the public school did not come into being until some fifty years after the Constitution began to operate. It can hardly be argued, I think, not even by Dr. Laring Sharp of Boston, that the Fathers set out to look for some force that would forever preserve the Republic, and found it in a system of non-religious schools erected, or to be erected, throughout the country. To begin with, they had never heard of any such system—and *ignoti nulla cupido*. In the second place, as good "Fathers of the Republic"

they knew that education was the concern of the local communities. I wish that Dr. Boynton had indicated the documents in which the Fathers write their creed so clearly, but he does not. He merely states that "in a wide correspondence from everyone of the forty-eight States, I find no public educator dissenting from this principle." It would seem highly probable that among his correspondents he numbers no teachers of American history.

For there *are* documents, few but of great worth, which testify to the belief of the Fathers in this matter. These documents do not sustain Dr. Boynton's contention. They refute it. Passing over the Virginia Bill of Rights (June 12, 1776), which says nothing of public schools but sets forth the "Resolution" afterwards embodied in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (September 28, 1776):

That no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles,

two great State papers may be cited. The first is the Northwest Ordinance of July 13, 1787, and the second, Washington's Farewell Address.

The legal value of the Ordinance is not material to this inquiry. The Congress of the Confederacy had no power to enact it; still as Channing well remarks, "the great Ordinance stands on a footing with the Declaration of 1776. It is a statement of principles, of ideals, which are to be lived up to and which, in a great measure, have been realized." But its value as a witness to the ideals and purposes of the Americans who framed it, is beyond question. Their enactment, although void of legal force, shows the type of school which in their judgment was to contribute to the welfare of the country.

Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The framers of the Ordinance first state a principle. "Religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government." Next, they select the means of reducing this principle to practice. The means they choose is the school, but not the institution of which the outstanding modern instance is the public school. The school which they in common with all colonial Americans had known, was a school which openly and without indirection or subterfuge taught religion and morality.

Thus these early Americans plainly predicated the continuance of good government upon the maintenance of the religious school. Dr. Boynton would have been nearer the truth had he written, "At the birth of this Republic, the Fathers made clear their belief that in religious education alone lay security for popular government."

The same truth is enunciated in Washington's Farewell Address, a document to which, in its main outlines, all the Fathers of the Republic subscribed. Jefferson wrote (in a letter to William Johnson, June 12, 1823) that parts of this document were composed by Madison, the Father of the Constitution, and parts by Hamilton, Washington's great Secretary of the Treasury. In his "Life of Alex-

ander Hamilton," the late Henry Jones Ford states that John Jay, appointed by Washington first Chief Justice of the United States, was consulted; and it is probable that the address was submitted to others besides Madison, Hamilton, and Jay. However this may be, the Address should be ranked with the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, and the Constitution, as an exposition of the principles and ideals of the Fathers of the Republic. To some of us Washington's counsels on "Religion and Morality" come with a familiar ring; but many modern ears, regrettably, are deaf to them. They assuredly can never be cited in proof of the contention that the security for popular government lies "in education alone," (unless "education" be taken in the sense it bears in Christian philosophy), or of that other claim that the school without religion is "the cornerstone" or even "a cornerstone" of the Republic. The noble passage cannot be too often reprinted.

"Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it be simply asked. Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

"It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

*"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge . . . ."*

I venture to italicize Washington's concluding words. The Father of his Country was a patron of schools, but he wished them to be active agencies for the promotion of that "Religion and Morality" which, in his mature judgment, constituted the "indispensable supports" of "political prosperity" and the "firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens." Schools were to be "institutions for the *general diffusion of knowledge*"—not for the diffusion of all knowledge except the knowledge of "Religion and Morality." Evidently the secular philosophy, now crystallized in the modern American public-school system, would have met scant favor at Washington's hands.

Long ago the last flickering ember of Salem's supposititious witch-fires was swept away by the winds that blow on

Gallows Hill. How many years must pass before the blasts of criticism likewise sweep away these following contentions?

(a) A system of education cannot be truly "American" if it includes training in "Religion and Morality."

(b) The educational system which can legally offer the boys and girls of this country no training in religion and morality, as the Fathers of the Republic understood the terms, is "the cornerstone" or "a cornerstone" of the Nation.

(c) In secular education "alone" is found the security for our form of government.

Old errors die hard. Few of us, I fear, shall live to see the interment of the errors I have catalogued.

### With Scrip and Staff

ROBERT Hugh Benson pointed out that for every objection to the Church and her methods you will always find someone objecting just the opposite.

A good instance of this sort of thing is found in the May *Century*. Professor Salvemini pleads against Fascism and Mussolini. He is able and eloquent, and would carry many Catholics with him if he would stick to the real merits of his case. But they will only distrust him when he writes that Pope Pius XI is a Fascist at heart, just held in check, it would seem, from inscribing himself in the Fascist party by the anti-Fascist sentiment of the lower Italian clergy.

The Pope has openly condemned certain Fascist principles, and is the only person in Italy who dares open his mouth on the subject. According to the Professor, however, this particular Pope does not mean what he says, in spite of the fact that the Popes are invariably found to mean what they say. "Pius XI," he writes, "strongly condemns the doctrines and methods of the Action Française; but he mildly deplores the identical doctrines and methods of the Italian Fascists, tactfully wrapping his criticism in an abundance of personal praise for Mussolini."

The doctrines and methods of the Action Française, however, are far from being *identical* with those of Fascism, though there are certain resemblances. The tactful and gentle warning of the Pope was directed against certain unchristian doctrines which have been formally taught by the French political leaders, but have not been propounded with the same ability or logic in Italy. The strength of the papal condemnation which later ensued was directed against an attitude of extreme criticism and insubordination on the part of certain individuals in France, for whom there is no counterpart in Italy. And these same individuals accuse the Pope of being a republican at heart, secretly in league with the Freemasons!

Catholics are accused of being narrow. Yet Professor Salvemini objects to the Pope seeing anything good in a person from which he is obliged to differ. The Church is accused of mixing in politics. Yet the Professor almost appears vexed because the Pope and the Cardinals do not

start a revolution and bombard the Prime Minister from the Vatican. Because the Church goes her way quietly in Mexico, she is "fomenting revolution;" because she goes her way in peace in Fascist Italy, she is "afraid of martyrdom." The moral of it is, that the Church follows but the one way, which is forever crossing the twisting paths of humankind.

WITH the spot light thrown on Italy's strong men, few think of her missionary giants, her Riccis and Bressanis in ancient days, her Massaias and Combonis in our own era. Fifty years have now passed since the great apostle of Central Africa, Monsignor Daniel Comboni, whom Pope Pius IX called "his own missionary," founded his two great religious institutes for African missionary work: the "Institute of Negro Missions" and its counterpart, the "Pious Matrons of Negro Missions (Pie Madri della Nigrizia)."

In 1864, while kneeling in prayer at the Tomb of St. Peter, during the splendors of the beatification ceremonies for Blessed, (later, Saint) Margaret Mary Alacoque, the great dominating idea of Daniel Comboni's life flashed upon his mind: "Regenerate Africa with Africa." Hence both Institutes were founded with the purpose of preparing the natives of Africa to undertake the evangelization of their own race.

"The Sisters are to be saints," declared their founder, "but saints with head erect: generous and ardent nuns, ready to suffer and die for the blacks."

Maria Bollezzoli, the quiet intrepid woman who collaborated with Comboni in this great work, began her Institute in Verona with one house and six sisters. In fifty years it has grown to 31 houses with 365 sisters who educate 4,050 pupils in their schools. In 1926 they took care of 212,000 patients and administered 9,100 baptisms.

FOREIGN admiration has been aroused, as in war times, by the fine spirit of generosity shown by the whole United States in coming to the relief of the Mississippi flood sufferers. It has shown that this spirit lies dormant in our population, and only awaits an occasion to show itself. An example of this was given earlier in the month, when a radio appeal in Philadelphia brought 1,500 volunteers who offered to give their blood to save the life of Sherman Winton, a seven year old child. The boy had tripped over a toy express wagon. Hemophilia followed, and efforts to check the flow of blood had been fruitless. But when the appeal had been broadcasted, within a few minutes five hundred men, women and children started to arrive at the hospital. A thousand telephoned that they were ready to give their blood.

Would that there were some way at hand by which these great stores of generous spirit, especially among our Catholic youth, could be turned into the great work of lifting our millions of fellow-countrymen out of their wretched plight of spiritual misery, of salvaging those whose homes are drowning under the ever-rising flood of infidelity!

THE PILGRIM

## An Anthology for Mary

### QUESTIONNAIRE

What did you think of, Mary,  
As He looked up from your breast?  
I saw His eyes like stars  
In the early evening west.

And when you bathed His limbs  
In waters warm and sweet?  
I loved Him, adorable, perfect  
From head to perfect feet.

What waking vision stirred you  
As He slept, small and weak?  
For hours and hours I watched  
The little curve of His cheek.

And when the first words came  
At length from His learning lips?  
I could feel my blood listening  
Down to my finger-tips.

On that amazing day  
Along the temple hall  
He taught the Scribes, you thought?—  
My Boy grows straight and tall.

At Cana when your words  
Hurried His coming hour,  
You saw?—I saw His hands,  
Beautiful, with power.

Oh, and when at the last  
He was slain by the crowd?  
Never of my dear Son  
Was I so fond, so proud.

Then, when His cheek to yours  
Lay lifeless and cold?  
I though how never now  
Would my Son grow old.

But, Ah, on Easter morn  
You had your heart's desire!  
He came to me at dawn  
And helped me with the fire.

Did you know that He was God?  
From Gabriel's word, of course,  
Alpha, Omega, of all  
The End and the Source.

But, women of all the world  
That ever children bore,  
Remember, He is my Son,  
And human, forevermore.

CHARLES L. O'DONNELL, C.S.C.

### A BOUQUET OF STARS

If I could walk in the meadow of sky,  
With the sickle moon in my hand,  
I'd cut all the blossoming point-petaled flowers,  
'Till knee deep in stars I'd stand.

I'd gather them all in the gossamer veil  
That some call the Milky Way,  
And carry them straight to a lovely maid:  
Our Lady, the Queen of May.

BERNARDINE BASSLER.

### TO THE NURSE OF MAN

(*After the Gaelic of Aonghus O Dailaigh*)

Shield me, O my nurse,  
Be my protection against the danger-day;  
From the eternal curse  
Shield me, I pray.  
Be my roof against the storm,  
My buckler against His mighty wrath,  
Save me from the devouring worm.  
Look on my sin, and hide  
It, not thy face.  
Hear my plaint, kinswoman,  
Full of grace.

Hear me, O my nurse,  
Thou who wert nurse to the Heaven-King;  
Show Him thy bosom fair,  
Remind His drinking  
Thy sweet milk, remind thy tears.  
Thy stainlessness alone, thy ways  
Alone can save me from foul sears  
Of sin. Born for the weal  
Of Adam's race,  
Hear my creel, kinswoman,  
Full of grace.

Lead me, O my nurse,  
Through the wood safely, hold tight  
My tugging hand in thine  
In paths of right.  
Thou who wert woodsman to tear  
The roots of the gnarled tree of debt,  
Thou who wert gardener to care  
A new and golden tree,  
Transcending space,  
Hear my song, kinswoman,  
Full of grace.

JAMES E. TOBIN.

### TO A CARRARA VIRGIN

Madonna,  
I have seen you come  
Down the long stair  
From heaven—  
A crown of stars upon your hair,  
Blue from the night in your eyes  
And blue for your gown  
Borrowed from summer skies.

Madonna,  
I have seen you come  
To the last stair leaning out  
Until your hair  
Like attar of roses  
Through the orient dusk  
Fell all along my arms outstretched.

Madonna,  
Tonight  
I am here,  
But you are white;  
You do not move.

SISTER MARIELLA, O.S.B.

### MATER PULCHERRIMA

Did God this virgin mould,  
Her hair a goldener gold,  
Her eye a bluer blue  
Piercing, transfixing you  
If haply you should meet  
Her on the busy street?  
Having of mother need,  
Did God excel, exceed,  
Within, without no less,  
Bestowing loveliness;  
Or how would she compare  
With maids we reckon fair  
Whose look I forfeit now  
With vigilance and vow?

"Peace, peace," my angel said  
Turning away his head.  
"Be for awhile content  
With aching wonderment.  
She waits atop a stair,  
Climb bruised and bleeding there.  
Let folk declare you died  
Restless, unsatisfied.  
If by Christ's help you be  
Ransomed eternally.  
Then, should her beauty, scanned  
Fall shy of what you planned —  
Hush! Can you doubt a bit  
God missed His mark a whit  
When He was put to it?"

LEONARD FEENEY, S.J.

### RENUNCIATION

O Virgin Mother of the Holy One,  
Of what avails this strife 'twixt thee and me?  
Lo, in this hour I give him back to thee:  
Deal gently with thine erring human son.

I give him back, his spirit-wings release,  
That he may rise beyond my yearning reach,  
Beyond all sound of my impassioned speech,  
And find, near thee, forgetfulness and peace.

Of alien creed, to thee I breathe one prayer:  
Touch, if thou wilt, each letter of my name  
That Love has graven on his heart in flame,  
And leave the imprint of thine image there.

CONSTANCE DAVIES-WOODROW.

### TO THOSE WHO SING OUR LADY

One night in my house I was all alone  
And with little to dream or do,  
I spoke to Our Lady who hung on the wall,  
"I'll spin a wee song for you."

So beating a time with the heels of my boots  
I fashioned a chest-full of notes,  
As easy and artlessly gathered as those  
That come from the feathery throats;

And somehow I fancied a hushing of wings  
On the rim of a far Paradise  
And the Heavenly People applauding because  
In pretense I was wondrously wise.

THOMAS BUTLER.

Literature

## Wrecker of Engines \*

JOHN MCHUGH STUART

A CENTURY ago, T. E. Lawrence at this stage of his career would have been a gilded nabob. At last reports he is a private in a British Tank Corps unit some place in India. That is his idea of reward for having with his slim bare hands torn a kingdom out of the flank of the great empire of the Soldan.

Out of the huge and mysterious book in which he has placed his record, he has vouchsafed to the public an abridgement. "Revolt in the Desert" is its trite title. Nothing else about it, or about Lawrence, is trite. Only now, as time gives perspective to the Great War, does the size of his military and political achievement in Arabia emerge from the obscuring smoke of nearer fronts. Only now, with the putting of so much of the man on paper, does the character of the man himself come clear of the legend grown about him; clear, but utterly unfamiliar by any other pattern of a man, unique.

Almost everyone who knows Lawrence loves him. Those elements of his character which rest upon his mode of life, his ambition, his valuation of things as they are, may be strange elements. But despite them the man radiates familiar warmth upon contact. He gives the inescapable impression of one who has plumbed the problems of human existence, who knows all that you know and finds in it good grounds for sympathy with you, but who still goes pushing on into realms of speculation and discovery where few will care to follow him.

Four of five years ago I knew him in London. Seeking information about that spectacular lady, Gertrude Bell, who did as much as Lawrence in forming the Arab kingdom after Lawrence had hacked it out, Winston Churchill sent me to him in the Colonial Office. He was then fat with ease. He must have weighed all of a hundred and twenty pounds. He is a handsome little jewel of a man, blond, blue eyed, delicately featured and a repressed bundle of controlled nerves.

Fat ease irked him. He refused to sit with me in the stuffy office assigned to him. Instead he shattered all official dignity in the quadrangular pile at Whitehall by twisting and squirming on a window sill in the vast and drafty corridor for one solid hour. But words flowed from him in a glowing stream. About his thin lips played always the charm of his quizzical smile, yet from his blue eyes shot the fire of enthusiasm. The story of Gertrude Bell, austere and beautiful daughter of a rich Midland ironmaster, who ruled as uncrowned Queen of Baghdad because of her knowledge of the desert and its people and their confidence in her whom they called simply "the woman" and thought to be the daughter of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba—Arab tradition having it that the

wise king did not resist the beautiful lady's wiles—is a great story and Lawrence told it mightily, and generously. His book as a well-told tale is no surprise.

It surprises in the glimpses it gives through all its pages of this indefatigable seeker of information on the riddle of existence who took in his stride the turning of the left flank of all the vast battle line that stretched from the North Sea to the Red. That is what he did. Alone, one October day in 1916 he put an Arab cloak and headcloth over his uniform and rode up from Harbigh on the Red Sea to the camp where Feisal, son of the Sherif of Mecca, lay despairingly with his ill-found army to confront a Turk-German column about to debouch from the rail head at Medina and swing down through the desert to holy Mecca, and perhaps thus to the conquest of the Islam world.

That column never debouched. Lawrence got Feisal supplies, and more, ideas. Back and forth by camel, by horse, by mule, afoot, in armored car and aeroplane Lawrence dashed for two years between this ragged Arab army and British headquarters in Egypt and in Palestine. And always and ever his dashings back and forth crept northward, hacking and slashing at the Hejaz railway which was the spinal column of the whole enemy effort, until at last he met the triumphant Allenby, coming from Jerusalem, at Damascus and there established Arab rule in the historic capital.

"Wrecker of engines" the Arabs called him because of his skill with high explosives against the railway. The quizzical detachment with which he recounts his exploits plus his subsequent strange career leads to the belief that Lawrence would like to put high explosives under almost any sort of engine, social as well as mechanical, to find out what makes the wheels go round. He had been a delving tramp among the ruins of ancient Arabia while still an undergraduate at Oxford. He knew this land from its buried records, oldest of all, down to the dialects and the personal habits of all its roving tribesmen of today. He gives a measure of the depth of this knowledge when he writes, of his student days:

My poverty had constrained me to mix with the humbler classes, those seldom met by European travelers, and thus my experience gave me an unusual angle of view, which enabled me to understand and to think for the ignorant many as well as for the more enlightened whose rare opinions mattered, not so much for the day, as for the morrow.

So, having built a kingdom for others, the spoils of victory had no temptation for him. My guess is that he has taken that delicately apprehensive mind of his to "mix with the humbler classes" about that other posing of the riddle of existence, India. Native existence would probable be impossible for him in that more crowded country for many reasons. But as a British Tommy he will be the free familiar of many a bazaar. There may yet be another Lawrence epic.

"Wrecker of Engines" he may be, but the term cannot connote anything sinister in connection with Lawrence. The mere warm friendliness of the man's presence belies

\*Revolt in the Desert. By T. E. Lawrence. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$3.00.

it on one side. The genial cheer with which he pays his literary respects to the ambitions of a king whose ancestry runs into the dimmest of all pasts, or with which he greets the depredations of a filth-bred flea in his own Arab shirt, puts Lawrence on the happy side. Is it all mere intellectual curiosity? No. There crops out occasionally through all the petty veneer of detachment that devotion to the idea of the British Empire as the mistress one serves, which the English smother in their deepest hearts.

But Lawrence is no respecter of persons. Even that idol of writing men, the proofreader, comes off second best with him. Lawrence gaily spells Arab names in half a dozen ways. To the shocked protest of the proofreader he says "Why not?" But the gem of his exchanges with that worthy is probably the following:

Proofreader: "Slip 53. 'Meleager, the immoral poet.' I have put 'immortal' poet, but the author may mean immoral after all."

Lawrence: "Immorality I know. Immortality I cannot judge. As you please. Meleager will not sue us for libel."

"Further expostulation," says the publisher, "was clearly impossible."

Impossible and unnecessary. Lawrence's narrative takes even a pedant swinging high over typographical sins into the full glory of the singing word. In his first sentence "the heat of Arabia came out like a drawn sword and struck us speechless." In his second, "the noon sun had, like moonlight, put to sleep the colors." But neither is speech stricken or color asleep through all its three hundred pages. The heat of the desert, the cold of the hills, the groan of camels and the drum of horses' hoofs, the clatter of machine gun and aeroplane, the grisly business of battle without quarter in the desert, the comings and goings of men in suffering and in surfeit, and the workings of their minds, all these are the warp and woof of the great picture. The proof of its artistry is that the feel of it all, its beauty as well as its meaning, reaches one who has never been nearer Arabia than Coney Island.

#### REVIEWS

**The Catholic Church and Its Reactions with Science.** By BERTRAM C. A. WINDLE. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.00.

In its apologetic value, this volume reaches, and in some ways surpasses, the high standards of the other works that comprise the Calvert Series. Sir Bertram Windle is not only an eager student of his Faith but is also an admitted authority on matters scientific. He asserts repeatedly that there is absolutely no conflict between the teachings of revealed religion and the findings of science, ancient or modern. To Catholics, his statement is neither new nor surprising; by non-Catholics, even those otherwise creditably intelligent and well-informed, it may be regarded as startling, as contradictory to what they have always heard and implicitly trusted. For such as these, he has written his treatise. He has not concerned himself so much with a positive exposition of how science has been furthered by Catholicism, but rather with a refutation of the antiquated notion that Catholicism is an enemy to scientific progress. In his refutation, he corrects the popular errors of fact and, what is more important, attacks the false mental attitudes of those who accept blindly these

factual blunders. People with this type of mind assert, for example, that there *must* be a conflict between the Catholic Church and physical science: therefore there *is*; that miracles are inexplicable: therefore they are impossible. Sir Bertram attempts to convert his readers from pseudo-science and groundless prejudice to honest thinking that is accurately scientific. After a series of chapters on general aspects of the relation that truly exists between Catholicism and science, he deals specifically with the current mistaken ideas as to the Catholic attitude towards astrology and astronomy, towards the creation of the world, towards biology and anthropology, and most especially towards the scientific data as given in the Bible. Throughout his treatise, Sir Bertram insists that the Church permits its scholars a large degree of freedom in speculation on scientific matters. It must be confessed that he has availed himself of this freedom in expressing some views that are not thoroughly agreeable to many Biblicalists and students of evolution.

A. T. P.

**Judaism.** Two volumes. By GEORGE FOOT MOORE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. \$10.00.

The Judaism here described is that of the age of Tannaim, a period coinciding with about the first and a half century of the Christian Church. Owing, however, to the fact that for a brief time the first Christian converts from Judaism still visited the Temple, besides offering the Divine Sacrifice in their own congregations, the author denies the existence of any Jewish Christianity during that entire period. Other Jewish writers have made the same claim in spite of the perfectly clear institution of the New Testament rite by Christ. The beginning of Christianity among the Jews is dated by him from the death in battle of the "Star Man," Bar Cocheba, who was acclaimed by Akiba as the "Star out of Jacob" in the days of Hadrian. The Judaism, therefore, explained in the two large and stately volumes, which are said to be the result of thirty years of study, goes back mainly to the compilation of the Patriarch Judah. His Mishna, composed about the year 200 of our era, was to remain sufficiently normative for Judaism during the centuries that have since elapsed. This newer Judaism is, in the author's view, far superior to the older religion of Israel. Books written after the beginning of the Christian era have for the writer the same value as the Scriptures composed before that date. Attention is often called by him to the two apocryphals, Esdras IV and Enoch, because of the considerable influence they exercised on Jewish thought. With his personal views on the Scriptures—their authorship, inspiration, Messianic message, etc.—Catholics must greatly differ. The value of his work lies in the vast use made by him of all the various rabbinical sources: the Mishna, the Midrash, and quite frequently also the *Midrash Haggadah*, or homiletic Midrash, in which the rabbis allowed themselves great freedom of interpretation and illustration. Credit should be given for his numerous quotations from these and other sources, as well as for the systematic development of his subject.

J. H.

**Sons of the Eagle.** By GEORGE CREEL. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Mr. Creel's conceit for plucking dominant figures out of America's past and gaily refurbishing them with romantic panoply, has done its part in the conception and execution of this new portrait series. His subjects, revivified and, at times, painfully realistic, have sprung into the midst of twentieth century life at the touch of a glowing and enthusiastically unrestrained style. Though the author is no Bancroft or Macaulay, yet, in his romanticism, he bursts upon the reader as a keenly pleasant antidote for the ugly, prying irrelevancies of the newer American biographers. Mr. Creel's method is patent. Color, romance,

heroism, are all qualities that have caught his fancy, and his gallery of figures ranging from Cortes to Custer and including Hamilton, Taylor, Grant and others, have been selected because they have possessed one or all of these characteristics. The indomitability of Cortes, the moral courage of Patrick Henry and of Grant, both awakened from an almost hopeless stupor by tricks of fortune, are fairly representative of the author's viewpoint and workmanship. And, like most romancers, he has permitted fortune to come in for her share of glory, as a factor in the turn of his subjects' destinies. But, Mr. Creel very humanly sins, and badly, because his vice is that of an historian. In order better to point up his own *dramatis personae* he smudges the other great figures that surround them. Jefferson is maligned for the sake of puffing Hamilton; so also Madison, Monroe, Clay and Webster. McClellan is a pronounced failure alongside of Grant's success. In addition to its bad historicity, this manner of historic eulogy is an implicit insult to Mr. Creel's own favorites since he thus insinuates that their own positive qualities are not, in themselves, adequate bids for immortality. Though Bradford has covered this field of research fairly well and with similar tools, and Mr. Creel himself adds nothing much in the way of history or narration, yet his characters are strikingly personal without losing their dignity as a result of the intimacy. At any rate, his enthusiasm is a ripple of freshness and buoyancy on a modern sea of gruff and salacious historical commentary.

E. F. McD.

**A History of American Foreign Policy.** By JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company. \$4.00.

Whether we will it or not, our United States cannot maintain the ideal program of splendid isolation in international politics. During recent months, the question of war-indebtedness and the problem of adherence to the League of Nations have kept us involved in the European scheme of things; the Civil War in China has drawn us deeper into Asiatic entanglements; the Tacna-Arica dispute, the Nicaraguan rivalries, and the Mexican effronteries have implicated us anew in Pan-American relations. Despite our best efforts to keep ourselves free from foreign embroilments, we cannot cease being a brother in the irascible family of nations. This volume surveys the disputes and the problems which the United States has had, at some time or another since 1776, with practically every civilized nation of the world. In the very early days of our national existence, the great problem of our statesmen was that of impressing on the Powers, especially England, France and Spain, the fact that the United States stood for certain Republican principles and ideals. With our internal consolidation being satisfactorily effected, a stronger policy of external independence of European influences was established, typified by the Monroe Doctrine. In rounding out our boundaries, in asserting our claims for fishery and other rights, in defending the interests of the other peoples of the two American continents, in preserving our national honor during the Civil War, the Foreign Relations department of our Government has been almost continuously engaged in averting a break, and even war, with other nations. In the earlier years our foreign relations were solely with the nations to the East of us. With time, they became almost equally engrossed with those to the South, and now they are taken up in a most important degree with the surging peoples and problems of the Pacific. Professor Latané has devoted separate chapters to the elucidation of the specific disputes in which this country has been engaged. He has mingled his facts and his interpretations of them with rare skill and scholarship. His personal opinions are for the most part moderate and conservative; but his apparent aim has been to keep his narrative completely objective. Not only does he handle his factual details as an historian but he also exposes them with the technique of a journalist.

V. E. R

#### BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Monks and Mystics.**—Self-sanctification through union with God is the monastic ideal. By prayerful meditation the devout recluse enriches his own life and is able from his superabundant spiritual knowledge to diffuse principles of holy living beyond his convent walls. Hence the pious Faithful must always welcome books from cloistered pens. Invariably they inspire and elevate. Of this sort is "The Practice of the Presence of God" (Benziger. \$1.25), being the conversation, letters and maxims of Brother Lawrence of the Resurrection, Barefooted Carmelite. Newly translated by Donald Attwater, it forms No. 3, Extra Series, of the Orchard Books.

In the same vein Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B., has revised and amended the first English translation of "The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi" (Benziger. \$2.00), of which Dominic Devas, O.F.M., writes the introduction. As published, it too is one of the Orchard Books, No. 12.

"The Spiritual Armour" (Benziger. 50c), by St. Catherine of Bologna, is the sole surviving ascetic teaching that we have from this fifteenth century abbess. Alan G. McDougall has translated it from the Italian and publishes along with it the treatise, "The Way of the Cross," commonly but questionably attributed to Blessed Angela of Foligno.

To encourage the popular reading of the works of St. John of the Cross and to help to their better understanding, a Monk of Parkminster has edited in English the "Light on Mount Carmel" (Benziger. \$1.95), of Ludovic de Besse, O.S.F.C. It is an excellent little handbook to introduce sincere Christians to mystical theology.

**Helps to Holiness.**—The meaning and value of human suffering in the cosmic scheme is one of the great conundrums of life. Outside the Catholic Church practically no adequate explanation of the purpose of physical pain and mental worry in the world, much less any real assistance to rise superior to earth's crosses is offered. In "Suffering: Its Meaning and Value" (Herder. 90c), Sister Mary Reginald Capes, O.S.D., adapts for English writers, the consoling conferences of Pere Laurent de Smet, S.J., on the subject. They teach the blessedness even of ill-fortune and how through Christian resignation that which usually begets unhappiness may be converted into a source of peace and merit.

Though primarily intended for Lent, "Christ in the Lenten Gospels and the Need of Religion" (Benziger. \$2.25), by Father Bampton, S.J., offers suitable and practical spiritual reading for almost any season of the year and for almost any personal mood. The first discourses of the volume are studies of Our Blessed Lord as presented by the Church in the Lenten Sunday Gospels; the thirteen last papers deal with man's need of God, the Church and the supernatural. The discourses are meaty and practical and afford the average Catholic layman a program of living, commonsense on the one hand and yet deeply and solidly spiritual on the other.

Daily devotions in honor of the Blessed Virgin during the month of May are characteristically Catholic. "Mary's Month" (Herder by Sister M. Emmanuel, O.S.B., gives Our Lady's clients a series of brief meditations on some of the titles of her Litany. Originally prepared for the use of pupils in our Catholic schools, they are not unsuited even for their elders.

**Aspects of Pedagogy.**—In the educational field the so-called scientific method is the modern avenue of approach to the study of the various branches that compose the school curriculum. Homer B. Reed in "Psychology of Elementary School Subjects" (Ginn. \$2.00), offers teachers and others interested in the sci-

tific study of education the results of the researches that have been made in primary school branches: reading, arithmetic, handwriting, spelling, language, history and geography. Two introductory chapters explain the scope of the book which is to demonstrate how the learning and teaching of these subjects "are influenced by native factors and by the application of the laws of repetition, association and satisfaction." Not all psychologists or students of pedagogy will universally accept the author's theories or conclusions though they cannot deny him credit for much painstaking research.

"Fundamentals of Business Organization and Management" (American Book Company), by William B. Cornell and John H. MacDonald, is a practical text for commercial students. The book treats of the organization of a business from its inception through its various stages of growth into a going concern. However, it limits its discussion to what the authors consider the essentials and fundamentals of every well-regulated business.

Joseph K. Hart presents in four papers under the title "Light From the North" (Holt. \$1.50), a survey and an interpretation of an interesting contemporary social and educational movement in Denmark. The study of the Danish "People's Highschools" tells the story of a rural experiment that has been going on with gratifying results for almost a century and from which Mr. Hart thinks the American people may learn a profitable lesson.

**Extravagant Theology.**—If one is to judge by "Miracles: A Modern View" (Bobbs-Merrill. \$2.50), its author Floyd L. Darrow is neither philosopher, theologian, scientist nor historian. With the flippant, cock-sure style which wins popularity for modern religious scoffers, he brazenly dogmatizes about matters of which he betrays stupendous elemental ignorance and on which the veriest Catholic high-school pupil could enlighten him. Despite his contention that miracles do not happen and never have happened, they remain incontestable experimental facts. His basic error is his definition of a miracle. If miracles are what he imagines them to be, Catholicism would be the first to deny their possibility.

Several years ago Sir James George Frazer gathered together into three volumes, called "The Golden Bough," a medley of curious yarns to juxtapose alongside of certain Old Testament passages, and his learned work has been used for the purpose of bringing the latter into disrepute. Later the *magnum opus* was boiled down to one volume. "Folk-lore in the Old Testament" (Macmillan. \$2.50), is a reprint of this abridged edition. While the author has made extensive researches into antiquarian lore, the facts that he marshalls do not at all warrant the conclusions drawn from them. The bridges erected to span fact and theory are for the most part frail and unsupported. Incidentally the book is none too carefully proof-read.

The widespread disregard of whatever is thought to impede the license which moderns call liberty—self-expression and self-realization—has brought about, if not a rejection, at least a very skeptical attitude toward the old notion of "conscience." In "A Treatise on Conscience" (Stratford), Charles Scaer essays to restore some of its former prestige and to vindicate its existence and authority. It is unfortunate that he did not consult St. Thomas. He would not then have made conscience a mere "feeling or emotion."

On the principle that what the Scriptures teach is truth but that what truth the Scriptures teach is ever an open question, Alonzo Robert Love makes his own inquiries into the great fundamentals of theology and voices them in "Under the Ban" (Stratford. \$3.00). The author has read much but not well. He quotes copiously but his exposition of Catholic dogmas and his interpretation of Catholic authorities are often amiss. For many of his errors he would find Sasia's "The Future Life" a powerful antidote.

**Rogues and Vagabonds. Brother Saul. The Friendly Four and Other Stories. Honor Bound. The Beadle.**

Five generations and a century of time are encompassed in the latest and most significant novel of Compton Mackenzie, "Rogues and Vagabonds" (Doran. \$2.00). Far back in 1829, Madame Oriano, a spectacular exhibitor of pyrotechnic displays, forced her daughter Letizia, a star performer, to marry Caleb Fuller, a sour-visaged, Puritanical, skin-flint. The two strains refused to combine; the Caleb strain was dominant in most of the children and grandchildren, but the Letizia appeared undiluted in the grandchild, Bram, who married Nancy O'Finn, the actress daughter of an Irish barnstormer. It is upon the theatrical experiences of Bram, Nancy and their precocious daughter, Letizia, that the story principally rests. In the matter of psychological probing into heredity and personalities, Mr. Mackenzie is as acute an observer as he was in the early novels that established his reputation. In the unfoldment of the story, he maintains a masterful degree of dramatic power. The most important phase of the novel, however, is that of the Catholic influence. The first Letizia's carelessness, Bram's desire of conversion, unfortunately not furthered by his wife, Nancy's own growing interest in her Faith, the convent education of her daughter, and the good results of it, all of these and other elements skilfully and artistically introduced, though not in all instances perfectly admirable, make this novel important not only in Mr. Mackenzie's career but also in Catholic fiction.

Turning from the romance of Ireland which he so gracefully glorified in his former books, Donn Byrne has attempted an historical novel of Apostolic times, "Brother Saul" (Century. \$2.00). The rich coloring, the brilliant massing of detail, the luscious emotion which characterize all his fiction is strong also in this story. In historical arraignment of custom and clashing races and world activity, the narrative conforms to accepted essentials, though the romancer's imagination at times carries him to exaggeration. As an interpretation of the Christ, of His apostles and disciples and the first years of the Church He founded, and principally of Saul, named Paul, the biography cannot be passed without some protest. For example, it accepts James as the blood-brother of Jesus, it magnifies the quarrel between Peter and Paul, it depreciates Peter, James and others, and fails to understand their spirit, it does not conform to Catholic history or theology in its account of the Church in Apostolic times, and, omitting other matters of importance, it takes liberties with the character and the career of Paul himself. There is no irreverence in Mr. Byrne's historical novel but there is a lack in it of the Catholic spirit.

What one with a good imagination can do with a given set of facts is well exemplified in "The Friendly Four and Other Stories" (Doran. \$1.75), by Ralph Connor. The author has set his imagination to work on some of the incidents narrated in the New Testament, and he has put the result of fact and fiction judiciously blended in these narrations. The interpretations are not such as Catholics might accept without reservation.

If Jack Bethea wrote "Honor Bound" (Houghton, Mifflin. \$2.00) as a piece of propaganda against the "convict lease system" he has accomplished his purposes brilliantly. The story has for its background the sordid and brutal system by which prisoners were really sold to men, whose only idea was to use these poor unfortunates to enrich themselves. The love episode that is worked into the book to relieve the dark and loathsome side of the story is quite shallow. It is not very clear just why and how the heroine lost her heart to the convict hero; yet one may suppose that such things are possible and credible.

Far from interesting are the homely sayings and doings of provincial folk. Neither do they gain attractiveness when narrated to serve as a background to a tale of remorse, unmanliness and unsophisticated sin. So it is that "The Beadle" (Doran. \$2.50), by Pauline Smith, must be classed as a novel at once displeasing and uninteresting. It cannot boast of a single really noble character; it is unrelieved either by action or high moral tone.

## Communications

*The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department.*

### Play Censorship in England

#### *To the Editor of AMERICA:*

"The Lord Chamberlain stops evil plays before they are produced," was the statement in AMERICA for March 19. It is true that he stops a few such plays, but considering the plays he permits one wonders where he draws the line. Your contributor seems to be describing the censorship as it ought to work, not as it actually works.

This very week an important and level-headed committee in London, the "Council of Public Morality" (not a crank group, but including in its membership clerics and laymen, lawyers, doctors and men of letters), resolved to present a memorial to the Lord Chamberlain protesting against "the improper language and profanity now rife upon the stage."

It further resolved to address remonstrances to those concerned in the production of seventeen plays produced since Christmas. Among the objections raised we find such expressions as these: "improper and profane language," "an entirely non-moral production, coarse language and flippancy," "several situations suggestive of immorality," "inadequate dress."

The present censor has licensed several plays that his predecessors barred as improper. I was a guest some time ago at a gathering of journalists and dramatic critics invited by one of our leading Catholics to meet him at a luncheon at his club and discuss what could be done to deal with the present condition of the stage. Most of those present were non-Catholics. One of them summed up his view by saying that the censorship was so utterly lax that it only served to protect improper productions from prosecution under the ordinary law.

London.

A. H. A.

### On a Criticism in "Thought"

#### *To the Editor of AMERICA:*

In his review of the book, "Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism," in the March issue of *Thought*, the Rev. Michael Kenny, S.J., avers that the five chapters contributed by the present writer are written "in such conciliatory mood that in summing the non-Scholastic views he seems at times to adopt them, especially in the exaggerated appraisal of Giordano Bruno, which his rebuttal leaves unqualified."

Only two of these chapters are devoted to summing up the non-Scholastic views: Chapter III of Part I and Chapter I of Part III. In both chapters these views are presented in a strictly objective fashion, without the slightest preference or comment as to their doctrinal value. It is therefore difficult to see how any unbiased critic could find that the writer "seems at times to adopt" any of the views thus impartially presented. Nor has any other of the many reviewers made a like assertion; on the contrary, several called special attention to the writer's objective manner of exposition.

It is true that in the above-mentioned third chapter the writer agrees with the non-Scholastics' charge of aloofness; this latter, however, is not a doctrinal point, but a generally admitted fact. Of course, in his constructive work every true Neo-Scholastic welcomes and assimilates every *true* teaching of modern and contemporary scientists and philosophers. In doing so, he is following right reason and the spirit of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris: vetera novis augere et perficere*. "The exaggerated appraisal of Giordano Bruno," made by non-Scholastics (and given in the concluding sentences of Chapter I, Part III), is not specifically dealt with in the following chapter. The reason for this is not because the appraisal is adopted, but simply because, as the reviewer could have learned from pp. VIII and 117, the aim of that chapter is to establish the correct interpretation of the for-

tunes of Scholasticism during the transitional period, and not to refute in detail or to qualify the non-Scholastic appraisals of the various Renaissance philosophers.

The reviewer seems to question the "conciliatory mood" displayed in the writer's contributions; but in the next sentence he rightly praises "the modes of modern reconciliation" recommended by the Scholastic contributors in Part II. Now it so happens that some of these Scholastics, seasoned scholars and competent critics, in their letters to the writer and in their reviews of the book, bear witness to the fact that the "mood" and the "modes" are in complete accord—that the writer's exposition of the Neo-Scholastic program and spirit meets with their whole-hearted approval. To quote only one. In his long article on the book (*Stimmen der Zeit*, December 1926, pp. 172-184), Dr. Jansen, the distinguished Jesuit and eminent Scholastic, assures his readers (p. 173) that the philosophic program outlined in Part III of the book is the conservative—progressive one followed in the leading centers of Neo-Scholasticism: the University of Louvain, the Catholic University of Milan, the Hertling-Baeumker School in Germany; also, that it is identical with the program championed by the *Stimmen der Zeit*, that excellent periodical conducted by the German Jesuits.

Moreover, in the Appendix to the book, the "conciliatory mood" is illustrated by recent works of two Jesuits, Dr. Maréchal of Louvain and Dr. Inauen, formerly of the University of Innsbruck. This "mood" emphasizes the truly irenic and constructive method of criticism: to discover in modern philosophy every kernel of truth and all possible points of agreement with the *philosophia perennis*, without any slurring or minimizing of essential differences.

Colorado Springs, Colo.

J. S. ZYBURA.

### A Catholic Girl's Experience with the Y. W. C. A.

#### *To the Editor of AMERICA:*

A. M. writes from Montana, in AMERICA of April 2, condoning his daughter's residence in a Y. W. C. A., after she had left home for a large western city to accept employment. That A. M.'s daughter was not affected by indifferentism (is he sure?) is no proof that others can be invited to "Y" vespers, as was his daughter, and not grow indifferent. Besides, there is the question of scandal to others.

Can a real Catholic girl find solace in lonesome hours in such a cold environment, amid people who, though well-meaning, are helpless to appreciate her point of view?

Depending on my daily toil in the newspaper field, I lived in more than one city in the Middle and Far West, quite alone, and still in the days of my youth I tried the "Y" twice. In a very few days I became disgusted with their proselytizing activities and made my way to secular surroundings, resolved never to try the "Y" again. Certainly the profit derived from one's stay at a "Y" is not calculated to help lessen the spread of either Protestantism or indifferentism. Economically there is nothing to be gained at a "Y," as the prices are quite on a par with costs elsewhere. As to safety, I have always found Catholic priests very willing to advise a girl where to go if she really felt she could not trust her own judgment.

A. M. said his daughter found at the Y. W. C. A. "a girl for every mood." Was she not aware that young ladies' sodalities, particularly active in the West, could have offered at least as much with the additional advantage of Catholic example? Besides, "for every mood" there is only one Friend, who in lonesome silence on our altars awaits our homage. Having this unchanging Friend and faith in God's Providence Catholic girls need not live at a Y. W. C. A.

This does not abstract from the need of a "Lady Isabella" surrounding for Catholic girls, but until that is forthcoming there is nothing for them to gain socially, economically or spiritually by being on familiar terms with the Y. W. C. A.

Brooklyn.

L. A.